UNITED NATIONS

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/CP/2000/3/Add.1
20 October 2000

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Sixth session
The Hague, 13-24 November 2000
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS AND OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION

REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY TO THE CONFERENCE

Addendum

REVIEW BY THE GEF OF ITS CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Note by the secretariat

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 12/CP.2,[1] adopted and thereby brought into force a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the COP and the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1). The MOU provides, *inter alia*, that the annual report of the GEF be made available to the COP through the secretariat. The MOU further provides, that, in accordance with Article 11.1 of the Convention, the COP will, after each of its sessions, communicate to the GEF any policy guidance approved concerning the financial mechanism.

2. In its reports to the COP at its fourth and fifth sessions, the GEF indicated that, in 1999, its monitoring and evaluation programme would undertake an evaluation of enabling activities in the climate change area. It further indicated that a proposed methodology for this evaluation would comprise a review of all relevant documentation, the views of the Parties as indicated in decision 12/CP.4, consultation with all GEF entities and the UNFCCC secretariat, as well as

[1] For the full text of decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its second session, see document FCCC/CP/19996/15/Add.1.

3. In response to the provision of the MOU, the GEF secretariat has submitted the attached report, which is reproduced without formal editing.

Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.16/10
October 3, 2000

GEF Council
November 1-3, 2000
Agenda item 12

REVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Editor's note:

The page numbers at the head of each page have been inserted by the UNFCCC secretariat, for technical reasons. The pagination provided by the GEF remains, as submitted, at the foot of the page, and refers to the table of contents.

Recommended Council Decision

The Council reviewed document GEF/C.16/10, *Review of Climate Change Enabling Activities*. The Council notes the recommendations contained in the review, and requests the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to take the report into consideration in future climate change enabling activity efforts. This applies particularly to the work of the Capacity Development Initiative, including the development of elements of a strategy and an action plan for capacity development in the area of climate change. The Council also invites the Secretariat to submit the review to the sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change pursuant to paragraph 6 of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Council of the Global Environment Facility

Review of Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects

October 2000

Core Team

Samir Amous, Team Leader/International Consultant
Jarle Harstad, GEF Corporate Monitoring and Evaluation Team
Martin Krause, UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
Bo Lim, National Communications Support Program
Ramesh Ramankutty, GEF Corporate Monitoring and Evaluation Team
Ademola Salau, UNDP-GEF Climate Change Team/
Regional Coordinator for Africa
Mahesh Sharma, World Bank
Ravi Sharma, UNEP
Miguel Perez Torralba, UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
Avani Vaish, GEF Secretariat

Country/Regional Case Studies

Mohamed El-Sobki, Egypt
Jaime Bustillo Pon, Honduras
Priyadarshi Shukla, India
Sivalingam Gunanathlingam, Malaysia
Cletus Springer, Caribbean region
John Hay, Pacific Islands region

Local Consultants

Aida Iskoyan, Armenia
Imran Behbudov, Azerbaijan
Emilio La Rovere, Brazil
Mauricio Meza Caestro, Bolivia
J.H. Chendjou, Cameroon
Riad Chedid, Lebanon
Lucy Khalema Redeby, Lesotho
Arona Coulibaly, Mali
Marisol Portal, Philippines
Khorrombi Matibe, South Africa
Nguyen Duc Minh, Vietnam
David Mbewe, Zambia

The views expressed in this study are those of the core team members and do not necessarily represent the views of all the team members, nor the GEF.

PREFACE

This report presents the findings of a review of GEF-funded enabling activity projects for climate change undertaken in response to a decision by the GEF Council at its meeting on October 14-16, 1998, where it recommended that the GEF carry out a comprehensive review of enabling activities to "determine how successful the projects have been, analyze the reasons for those that have failed, and consider policy and programmatic responses to the problems."

The main audience for this review, in addition to the GEF Council, consists of the cooperating countries, the Secretariat for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, implementing and executing agencies, non-governmental organizations and private enterprises engaged in climate change matters.

The terms of reference for the review was prepared by the GEF Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator in consultation with UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, and the UNFCCC Secretariat. The Terms of Reference constitutes Annex 1.

The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator assembled the core team, consisting of Samir Amous (independent consultant and team leader) and staff from the various relevant entities. The core team was assisted by local consultants in carrying out country visits, and local/regional consultants in the preparation of country and regional case studies. The team is listed in Annex 2.

From February to May 2000, the team members collected data from a variety of sources, and meetings were held with the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, Secretariat for the UNFCCC and other organizations, including NGOs. The team gathered data and had discussions in 12 countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mali, Philippines, South Africa, Vietnam, and Zambia. Country case studies were prepared on Egypt, Honduras, India, and Malaysia. In addition, regional case studies were prepared on the islands in the Caribbean and the Pacific respectively. Statistical data was also collected on enabling activity projects in all the 132 participating countries.

During May-September 2000, the team leader prepared draft reports based on inputs from the team, the GEF Secretariat, and the three Implementing Agencies. Advanced drafts of the report were sent to the UNFCCC Secretariat, and the GEF operational and political focal points in the above-mentioned countries. The final report was presented to the GEF Council for discussion at the November 2000 Council Meeting.

This review is a result of an extensive collaborative effort between the review team-members. The views expressed in the final report are those of the core team members. These views do not, however, necessarily represent the views of all team members, nor the GEF. I am truly grateful to all those who participated and contributed to the study, especially in the 16 countries and two regions mentioned above.

Jarle Harstad
Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This review was made possible by the excellent cooperation extended by the governments and other project participants in the countries that were visited to collect information and countries whose experiences were documented under the country or regional case studies.

Our thanks are due to the local consultants in the 12 countries that we visited, who helped us by preparing the groundwork for the review exercise, arranging for meetings with government agencies and other project participants, including NGOs and academic institutions, and following up on any issues that required further inquiry. The consultants who undertook the regional and country case studies approach their individual assignments with utmost professionalism and delivered studies that proved very useful in preparing the final report. We would also like to thank Chemonics International, Washington, D.C., for identifying and recruiting the consultants.

The review benefited from discussions with Claire Parker, Martha Perdomo and George Manful at the Secretariat for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Jack Fitzgerald of the United States Country Studies program was helpful in discussing the experiences under that program. Sam Fankhauser, currently with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, was kind enough to brief us on the early days of the enabling activity projects when he was at the GEF Secretariat.

Staff at the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank were willing to spend time with us sharing their perspectives and insights regarding the GEF and its operations. Particular mention must be made of the immense contribution of William Faries, a consultant for the GEF Secretariat, who participated in the data analysis and in editing and finalizing the review report.

The report was desk-topped by Elizabeth George of the GEF Corporate Monitoring and Evaluation Team.

Samir Amous
Team Leader

Ramesh Ramankutty
Task Manager

On behalf of the core team for the GEF Review of Climate Change Enabling Activities

Table of Contents

Preface iii
Acknowledgement iv
Table of Contents v
Acronyms and Abbreviations vii
1 Summary and Recommendations 1
Introduction 1
Review of the GEF Enabling Activity Portfolio for Climate Change 1
Overall Findings 3
From COP Guidance to Operationalization 4
Implementation Issues 8
Project Results 12

II. COP Guidance and GEF Responses 17
Elements of COP Guidance to the GEF Relevant to Enabling Activities 17
GEF Response to Guidance from the COP 19
Assessment of the GEF Response 21

III. Effectiveness of Operational Guidelines 25
Interpretation of the Operational Guidelines 25
Applicability and Flexibility to the Countries' Needs 25
Effects of Expedited Procedures on Project Processing 26
Disbursement Issues 29
Dissemination of Operational Guidelines 29

IV. Portfolio Overview 31
Analysis of the Climate Change Enabling Activities Portfolio 31
Budget for Administration Costs 32
Administrative Support for Project Management from the Corporate Budget 33
Executing Agency Fees/Agency Support Costs 34
Overall Analysis of the Budget Support Issues 34

V. Design and Implementation 35
Effectiveness in Meeting the Objectives Set Forth by the Operational Guidelines 35
Efficiency of the Project Design Cycle 38
Time Constraints 39
Funding Constraints 40
Roles of the Partners in the Enabling Activity Project Cycle 41
GEF Secretariat 42
UNDP 43
UNEP 46
The World Bank 47
Implementation of Other Climate Change Work 48
Technical Support 50
Country Level Implementation Issues 55
Assessment of Reporting and Management Procedures 59

VI. Project Results 61
Technical Products 61
Other Achievements 62

VII. Good Practices 67
Achieving Additional Benefits That Serve Regional and International Concerns 67
Achieving Outreach and Information Exchange Benefits Through the Use of Internet 67
Involving the Media in the Public-Awareness Effort 68
Developing Interaction Between Projects 69
Participation in International Training Workshops and International Events 69
Enhancing Political Support from the Highest Levels of Government 70
Wider Participation of the Stakeholders 70
Flexibility in Reallocating Project Funding 71
Flexibility in Redesigning the Project Activities 71

Annexes
1. Terms of Reference 75
2. The Review Approach 83
3. List of Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects 87
4. Documents and References Consulted 90
5. 1996 Criteria and 1997 Guidelines: Cost Norms 92
6. Criteria for Reviewing Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects as Included in Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities - 1996 93
7. Annexes Included in Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities - 1996 94
8. Annexes Included in Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from Non-Annex I Parties - 1997 95
9. Paragraphs of Decision 11/CP.2 that are Relevant to Enabling Activities 96
10. Needs and Major Priorities Expressed by the Beneficiary Countries for the Development of the Future EA Projects 97
11. Questionnaire for the Survey Undertaken by the Review 99
12. Synthesis of Views of the Parties Regarding the Review of Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects 107

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ALGAS	Asian Least-cost Greenhouse Gas Abatement Strategy
CC	Climate Change
CPACC	Caribbean Planning for Adaptation to Global Climate Change
COP:	Conference Of Parties
COP1	First Conference of Parties held in Berlin in March-April 1995
COP2	Second Conference of Parties held in Geneva in July 1996
COP3	Third Conference of Parties held in Kyoto in December 1997
COP4	Fourth Conference of Parties held in Buenos Aires in November 1998
COP5	Fifth Conference of Parties held in Bonn in October-November 1999
EA	Enabling Activity
ENDA-TM	Environnement et Développement du Tiers-Monde
EP	Expedited Procedure
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF CEO	GEF Chief Executive Officer
GEFSEC	GEF Secretariat
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Zusammenarbeit (Germany)
IA	Implementing Agency
NCCC	National Climate Change Committee
NCSP	National Communication Support Programme
NEP	Non-Expedited Procedure
PICCAP	Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Project
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice
SPREP	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TPR	Tripartite Review
UCCEE	UNEP Collaborating Centre on Energy and Environment (Riso-Denmark)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USCSP	United States Country Study Program

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. This report presents the findings of a review of GEF-funded climate change enabling activity projects. Funding for climate change enabling activity projects was launched by GEF as a response to guidance from COP 1 requesting the GEF to give priority to supporting non-Annex I Parties in meeting their commitments under the UNFCCC.[1]

2. The commitments of non-Annex I Parties mainly relate to the preparation of Initial Communications (IC) to the UNFCCC, which requires the implementation of relevant activities, mainly focusing on[2] (i) Preparation of greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories and other climate change-related information; (ii) General description of steps taken or envisaged to implement the Convention; and (iii) Any other information relevant to the achievement of the objectives of the Convention.

3. The COP guidance was issued as a response to Article 12.7 of the UNFCCC stating that "The COP shall arrange for the provision to developing country Parties of technical and financial support, on request, in compiling and communicating information under Article 12, as well as identifying the technical and financial needs associated with the proposed projects..." In the context of climate change, enabling activities were defined by the COP as "Measures such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures."[3]

4. The enabling activity program was part of the GEF operational strategy that aimed to support non-Annex I Parties in fulfilling their commitments under the UNFCCC at full cost funding. According to the GEF *Operational Strategy*,[4] enabling activities "include [GHG] inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and strategies and action plans. They either are a means of fulfilling essential communication requirements to the Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country."

REVIEW OF THE GEF ENABLING ACTIVITY PORTFOLIO FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

5. This review began in February 2000. At that time, 115 countries had implemented national climate change enabling activity projects, while 10 other regional/global climate change enabling activity projects had also been

1 Decision 11/CP.1

2 UNFCCC, Article 12.1.

3 Decision 11/CP.1, item b(i) in document FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1, Report to COP1-Berlin, 28 March to 7 April, 1995. Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its First Session.

4 Page 9. *Operational Strategy*, Global Environment Facility, February 1996.

launched. The main objective of the review is to take stock of the past and ongoing experience with the enabling activity projects for climate change, assess their effectiveness and extract lessons for the future. More specifically, the review had to examine: (i) the effectiveness of the enabling activity modality; (ii) the effectiveness and efficiency of both GEF approval and national execution processes; (iii) influence on broader capacity building and/or planning in countries through the preparation of initial national communication process; and (iv) best practices for the implementation of enabling activity projects from country experiences.

6. The terms of reference of the review are included in Annex 1. Prior to its finalization, consultations were held within the GEF Secretariat, the three Implementing Agencies, and the UNFCCC Secretariat. As recommended by the COP, the terms of reference paid particular attention to addressing the questions and views expressed by the Parties with respect to the review of enabling activities. The terms of reference have defined seven major issues to be addressed by the review: (i) Response to guidance from the COP; (ii) Effectiveness of the Operational Criteria; (iii) Portfolio Overview; (iv) Project Design and Implementation; (v) Project Results; (vi) Best Practices; and (vii) Recommendations.

7. The review does not claim to be fully representative of the actual performance and achievements across the whole portfolio. Nor does it provide the final results and impacts in all the 115 countries supported. However, the review was based on a large set of information collected from a variety of sources, including consultations with the major actors of the enabling activity process[5]. Specifically the review approach included: (i) Review of COP decisions and SBI/SBSTA communications; (ii) Views related to enabling activities expressed by the Parties through the Convention process; (iii) Consultations with relevant stakeholders (UNFCCC Secretariat, bilateral and multilateral donors, and international, regional and local NGOs); (iv) Country visits by members of the core review team assisted by national consultants; (v) Country case studies prepared by national consultants; (vi) Regional case studies prepared by regional consultants; (vii) Questionnaire survey; (viii) Review of documentation available at the three Implementing Agencies (including the National Communications Support Programme), the GEF Secretariat, and the UNFCCC Secretariat; and (ix) Discussions with the three Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat.

8. The review included close examination of 18 enabling activity projects. Twelve national projects were visited by the review core team[6], four other national projects were covered by country studies[7], and two regional projects in the Pacific Islands and Caribbean[8] were reviewed by regional consultants.

---

5 The approach used for undertaking this review is described in detail in Annex 2 of this report.

6 Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bolivia, Cameroon, Mali, Lebanon, Lesotho, Philippines, South Africa, Vietnam, and Zambia.

7 Egypt, Honduras, India, and Malaysia.

8 Five countries each in the Pacific (Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Samoa and Vanuatu) and Caribbean (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and The Grenadines, Guyana) were visited/studied by each of the regional consultants for the PICCAP and CPACC projects respectively.

OVERALL FINDINGS

9. The overall conclusion of the review is that support provided by the GEF for climate change enabling activities has substantially contributed towards assisting non-Annex I Parties in meeting their communication commitments under the UNFCCC. The GEF Secretariat and its Implementing Agencies have undertaken a large challenge in a new and complex area of international cooperation. Despite the complexity of the task and the difficulties encountered, the GEF role has, by and large, been positive. To some extent, many of the difficulties faced appear to be "teething" problems. Both the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat have learned from their experiences and their performance has improved through time.

10. Of the 132 countries that have received GEF grants through the enabling activity process, 25 have already transmitted their initial communication to the UNFCCC as of May 2000.[9] Among these countries, 23 implemented enabling activity projects through UNDP,[10] and two through UNEP. A large number of countries are currently progressing towards the completion of their initial communication for a possible transmission by COP6.

11. The review observes that, for the most part, the quality of the documents produced under the enabling activity projects was satisfactory. In some cases, the quality of the documents was impressive, and provided not only national, but international benefits as well.

12. Capacity building was one of the key objectives of the enabling activity process. The review found undeniable evidence that enabling activity projects made considerable progress in strengthening the capacities of countries to deal with climate change issues.

13. While the overall impact is positive, the enabling activity program experienced many difficulties, largely due to the novelty and complexity of climate change issues, as well as the constraints that surrounded the development of enabling activity projects. These constraints included definition of the scope and objectives of the projects, time pressure, funding limitations, etc. For instance, the review found that the enabling activity projects placed undue emphasis on obligations of the countries (i.e. preparation of the national communication) at the expense of responding to country needs and priorities.

14. While the results achieved are more than the minimum required for initial communications, the GEF-sponsored enabling activities are neither a clear step in the direction of sustainable capacity building, nor have they helped countries prepare to develop policies and strategies required to deal with climate change. Supporting this finding, the review also found that the countries had higher expectations for capacity building than what the enabling activity projects could offer.

15. Enabling activity projects also focused on achieving other ambitious objectives, including sustainability of capacities, establishment of information systems for GHG inventories, public awareness, sustainability of institutional arrangements, and integration of climate change concerns into national development policies. Many of these objectives—particularly the last one—have not been satisfactorily completed in any country. Considering the limited funding allocations, short duration of the projects (1-2 years), and limited national capacities at the

---

9 In addition, Kazakhstan has also transmitted its initial communication, although it did not implement any GEF-supported enabling activity project.

10 Six of the 24 UNDP countries completed their initial communication through the PICCAP project.

beginning of the process, this review finds that the enabling activity projects hadunrealistic expectations when setting such objectives.

16. Thus, the first round of enabling activities should be considered a first step in a continuous and long-term series of efforts to establish a sustainable framework for meeting Convention obligations while also leading to concrete actions.

FROM COP GUIDANCE TO OPERATIONALIZATION

❒ *FINDINGS*

✓ *The GEF Response to COP Guidance*

17. Three major sets of enabling activity-related guidance were issued by the Conference of Parties. COP1 (**11/CP.1**) directed the GEF to give priority to the support of national communications referred to in Article 12.1 of the Convention. COP2 adopted detailed guidelines for the content of the first national communications from non-Annex I parties (**10/CP.2**) and confirmed that these new guidelines and format would form the basis for the funding of communications from non-Annex I Parties. At COP4, guidance to the GEF emphasized the need for funding support to prepare initial and subsequent national communications "by maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacity" (**2/CP.4**).

18. The GEF responses to COP guidance took between 8 and 12 months. In response to COP1 guidance, the GEF developed *Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities*. Following the COP2 guidance, the GEF issued new *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing*, clearly tying the Activity Matrix and the Cost Norms to the guidelines for national communications defined in 10/CP.2[11] Finally in response to COP4 guidance, the GEF issued *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing – Part II* to comprehensively respond to the capacity building needs of non-Annex I parties, beyond the initial priority of first national communications.

19. While the elapsed time for the GEF response in these cases may seem long, developing enabling activity projects was a novel experience and the GEF needed sufficient time to define the appropriate approach to expediting its procedures. In addition, the COP decisions tended to cover a large number of issues at once, giving room for divergent interpretations and making the process of operationalization very complex.

20. In practice, the review finds thatas soon as the national communication was identified as the main objective of expedited enabling activity projects, the GEF guidelines adequately responded to the COP guidance. Thus, despite some uncertainty regarding the primary role of enabling activities, the GEF response is judged to have been pragmatic and timely.

21. The *Operational Guidelines for Enabling Activities* was developed by the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with the three Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat, and subsequently approved by the GEF Council. It should be noted that these consultations did not directly involve the countries. The review also received mixed feedback regarding incorporation of the views of the GEF partners[12] by the GEF Secretariat when drafting the final *Criteria*.

---

11 The purpose of the activity matrix is to identify and assess any relevant activities that the GEF and/or other funding bodies previously supported in the countries.

12 UNDP, UNEP, The World Bank and the UNFCCC Secretariat.

✓ *Operationalization of the GEF Guidelines*

22. While it was clear to the implementing agencies that the emphasis of the enabling activity projects was on the rapid preparation of the initial communication, there were instances of divergent interpretations between the GEF entities,[13] particularly at the beginning of the process.

23. In addition, the recipient countries did not always interpret the GEF guidelines and the COP guidance along the same lines as the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. For instance, higher funding support from GEF was requested by countries for meeting their priority needs, such as capacity building, or for launching additional studies in some critical aspects of climate change, such as vulnerability and adaptation assessments. Such misinterpretation resulted, in some cases, in long negotiations which delayed the overall project approval process. This caused frustration in the countries regarding the effectiveness of enabling activities in meeting their expectations.

24. The review finds that the *Operational Guidelines* placed a strong presumption on the success of previous enabling activity initiatives, whether funded by the GEF or other donors, without any objective assessment of the content and quality of the products generated by these previous efforts. Since participation in earlier projects was considered as the basis for defining the amount of funding a country would receive from the GEF, this was the most frequently debated issue during project negotiations between the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the countries. On certain projects, unfair competition, mainly focusing on the overall funding level, hampered the collaborative spirit between the Implementing Agencies involved.

✓ *Effectiveness of Enabling Activity projects in meeting the objectives set forth by the Operational Guidelines*

25. While enabling activity projects generally met the objectives set forth in the *Operational Guidelines*, the review team observed that "country drivenness" was narrowly interpreted in terms of endorsement of projects by the national GEF operational focal points, without appropriate stakeholder consultations and assessments of national priorities. This was part of the trade-off that the expedited procedure process has necessitated.

26. While most of the national GEF focal points were familiar with the GEF *Operational Guidelines*, the review finds that neither the Implementing Agencies nor the GEF national focal points made efforts to widely disseminate these guidelines within the countries. This often prevented a more effective inclusion of wider sectoral concerns into the project proposals.

27. In addition, the use of cost norms also presented the countries with a *fait accompli*, providing little flexibility and no fungibility of funds. There is also concern as to whether the Activity Matrix truly addressed the countries' expectations and priorities.

✓ *Project processing*

28. The overall objective of introducing expedited procedures for enabling activities was to reduce project processing time and provide timely resources to countries to meet their reporting obligations under the Convention. Under the expedited procedures for enabling activities, the GEF Council delegated the approval authority, for projects requesting less than US$350,000, to the Chairman/CEO of the GEF.

13 UNDP, UNEP and The World Bank.

29. During the period 1995-1998, there was a significant decrease (60%) in the time taken to process a project under expedited procedures —from an average of 499 days in 1995 to 188 days in 1998.[14] While each of the main partners (Implementing Agencies, GEF Secretariat, the countries) are partly responsible for the excessive elapsed time during different stages of project design and processing, some of this delay can be attributed to a necessary learning period in the implementation of COP guidance —compounded by a lack of clarity in COP guidance—and different interpretations of the GEF guidelines.

30. Nevertheless, this review finds that 188 days for processing enabling activity projects **under a procedure that is supposed to be expedited** is still too long. While the GEF partners have considerably decreased the elapsed time at the three initial milestones of the project processing cycle[15] there is room for reducing the elapsed time even further through the removal of major bottlenecks at the two latest milestones, including at the country level. But any further reduction in processing time needs to be waged carefully in light of the recommendations for broader stakeholder consultation.

31. While some countries have complained of disbursement delays, the review found that these occurred in only a few instances and rarely affected project implementation. Rather, more significant implementation delays have been caused by issues such as development of the budget and work plan, identification of consultants, and establishment of institutional arrangements.

❒ *RECOMMENDATIONS*

32. It is recommended that the GEF establish a better consultative process for the formulation of the next GEF guidelines for enabling activity projects. This process should allow for a more effective role of the Implementing Agencies in the finalization of the guidelines and a more collaborative spirit among all the actors of the enabling activity process, including the countries. In this context, it is suggested that the GEF partners explore adequate ways and means for involving technical experts from the recipient countries in these consultations.

33. The review finds that greater precision in COP guidance and GEF guidelines could go a long way towards removing ambiguities associated with the definition and the finality of some terms (e.g. enabling activity, capacity building, etc.) and help in an uniform application of the guidelines. In order to avoid future disappointments, the GEF guidelines should also be applied more flexibly in the future, particularly with respect to the cost norms and activity matrix. However, this should be accomplished while maintaining a consistent application both across the Implementing Agencies and the recipient countries.

34. The review recommends that a fuller assessment of the quality of climate change related activities previously undertaken be factored into the context when finalizing the level of GEF support. It is also important that the countries, the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat be more focused and realistic when setting project objectives and

---

14 Number of workdays elapsed from date of receipt of the project proposal at the GEF unit of the implementing agency to the date of project start (signature of project document).

15 Five main milestones were identified at the project processing level: (i) Request to IA to Receipt at GEFSEC; (ii) Receipt at GEFSEC to CEO approval; (iii) CEO approval to IA approval, (iv) IA approval to project start; and (v) project start to first disbursement.

expectations, given the available funding and time horizon. In this context, a more systematic strategy aimed at ensuring the establishment of a sustainable enabling activity process should be defined by COP and operationalized by the GEF.

35. Given the quick evolution of the climate change process, and the recurrent evolving needs of the countries, the challenge for future GEF enabling activity initiatives is to react rapidly to changing circumstances. Therefore, additional efforts are required by the GEF and its Implementing Agencies to further streamline the processing of enabling activity projects. While this inevitably implies some trade-offs, it is important that any possible deviation from the original spirit of the enabling activity projects that may result from these trade-offs is minimized.

36. The review also recommends that the Implementing Agencies and the national GEF focal points disseminate rapidly and widely any new GEF guidelines within the countries, or any material that can be relevant for the development of the enabling activity project proposals. Also, the countries should facilitate the process of stakeholder consultations, negotiations with the Implementing Agencies, and signature and project approval, and remove the administrative barriers that significantly hamper project approval and implementation.

37. In addition, the review also recommends that a more balanced approach, with appropriate stakeholder participation and consultation and an assessment of national priorities, be part of the "country driveness" of project proposals.

38. The major milestones of the project design process should be made more transparent, mainly through better sharing of information on the progress within the design cycle, including the country-level endorsement, so that the main partners involved can follow the process closely and intervene to break unnecessary deadlocks if needed. For example, a "project status sheet" could be established and distributed to all the relevant people within the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and the countries, highlighting the different steps of the processing cycle and the necessary details to identify the actual status of the project in the cycle. While greater transparency in the project cycle might require additional resources, this is a critical issue and one which the review recommends that the GEF explore.

39. UNDP has made considerable efforts to shorten the project processing cycle over the past five years to remove bottlenecks[16] However, the elapsed time for project processing by UNDP should be shortened even further in order to expedite implementation.[17] UNEP also undertook a number of measures,[18] as early as 1996, aimed at expediting the internalization of its GEF activities, including enabling activity projects. However, the review found that for enabling activities managed by UNEP there is room for further improvement in processing times.

40. In order to facilitate the implementation of these recommendations, it is suggested that a "Good Practice" manual be developed by the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies, addressing the modalities for formulating and implementing enabling activity

16 For instance, many UNDP country offices advanced funds from their own budgets as soon as the project document was signed, in order to allow the project to quickly begin. More recently, a new system is being put in place to expeditiously process the top-up projects but the analysis of this system was beyond the scope of the review.

17 In particular, modalities for the recruitment of consultants, approval of the quarterly financial reports and budget advances requests, etc., should be processed by UNDP more efficiently.

18 This included establishing a Project Coordination Committee entrusted with reviewing and adopting GEF activities separate and distinct from UNEP Project Approval Group.

projects. This manual should be distributed to the Implementing Agencies and their representatives, as well as to the countries, allowing for a uniform interpretation of the GEF guidelines.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

❒ *FINDINGS*

✓ *Project duration*

41. The review notes that, with few exceptions, most countries experienced difficulties in completing their enabling activity projects within the timeframe defined in the project documents. In that respect, expectations in terms of project duration were unrealistic. Several factors explain the longer time horizon needed for the implementation of projects, such as (i) Starting difficulties (nominating or recruiting a project coordinator, selecting an appropriate team, building the relevant institutional arrangement, etc.); (ii) Availability and reliability of data; and (iii) Longer time needed for the validation of technical outputs by all the concerned stakeholders.

✓ *Funding Issues*

42. The review finds that, in general, the level of funding support has been sufficient for the preparation of the national communication, and other basic documents. However, objectives linked to the sustainability of capacity building and institutional arrangements, as well as the integration of climate change concerns into national development policies, were unrealistic given the timeframe and the funding levels.

✓ *Budget support to the Implementing Agencies*

43. The estimated budgetary resources provided for enabling activities to the Implementing Agencies are judged to be inadequate. This might have limited the capacities of the Implementing Agencies to provide consistent technical and supervision support. The GEF seems to have recognized this weakness. Under the new fee-based system, the implementing agencies receive US$54,000 per enabling activity project towards administrative expenses covering the full project cycle.

✓ *Roles of the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies*

44. The countries, the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat have all played essential roles in the development of the climate change enabling activity portfolio. During project implementation, however, the involvement of the GEF Secretariat was quite limited, while the Implementing Agencies and the countries were fully involved.

45. Overall, the needs of the recipient countries for technical and managerial support were higher than originally anticipated in the early phase of the program. According to the Implementing Agencies, the GEF guidelines did not give room for more substantial support to the countries and this prevented them from allocating the level of human resources that would have better met country needs.

46. Given these resource constraints, UNDP viewed its role as mainly consisting of management oversight, with any possible technical contribution provided on an ad-hoc basis. UNEP responded to the needs for technical support, in part, through assistance in procuring appropriate consultants and advisors. In practice, technical assistance was provided through consultants hired by the individual projects. While the Implementing Agencies provided advice and assistance within the limitations of their financial resources, the responsibility for implementation and daily management of projects was that of the national executing agency. GEF later responded to these needs for additional technical assistance by funding the National Communication Support Program (NCSP).

47. The UNDP country offices were critical in ensuring general management oversight, including administrative support; serving as a liaison with UNDP New York; and facilitating the development and implementation of the projects. Even though they had a limited technical contribution at the outset, some UNDP country offices later strengthened their ability to address global environment issues by enhancing their human resources.

48. While the modalities of UNEP interventions are based on direct contact with the national executing agencies, the reaction of UNEP in addressing institutional or other kinds of problems at the national level was usually neither timely nor adequate. UNEP decided not to interfere in resolving what it considered as internal institutional issues of the countries concerned. For instance, among the five UNEP-managed projects visited under this review, three suffered from delays caused by in-country institutional difficulties affecting implementation.

✓ *Assessment of Reporting and Management Procedures*

49. Overall, the reporting and management procedures established by the Implementing Agencies do not allow for appropriate monitoring and supervision of enabling activity project implementation, particularly on technical issues. To some extent, the NCSP has contributed to filling this gap. However, the institutionalization of an adequate reporting and management function in the GEF is a crucial issue, while the NCSP has only a limited duration.

50. In the case of UNDP, supervision of the implementation of enabling activity projects is delegated to the UNDP country offices. As a result, the major monitoring mechanism for UNDP is the Annual Programme/Project Report (APR), drafted by the project coordinator and submitted to the UNDP office in the country in preparation for the annual Tripartite Review (TPR)—a high policy-level meeting to assess progress based on the APR and make management recommendations if necessary. Nevertheless, as they are presently formulated, the APRs and TPR reports cannot be considered relevant tools for technical oversight and supervision of the projects.

51. Since UNEP does not have any country offices, implementation supervision is centralized at the UNEP headquarters in Nairobi with the support of its regional offices. The major supervision mechanisms for UNEP consists of continuous interaction with the national project coordinators, and quarterly progress reports that are submitted by the project coordinator. However, this review finds that the quarterly progress reports are not substantive and do not clearly identify problems in project implementation. While the project manager is usually aware of problems in project implementation, his broad portfolio and other responsibilities often preclude him from responding effectively to problems as they develop during implementation.

52. As for the overall management, the review finds that there is currently no systematic process in place—except the NCSP, which has a limited lifespan—to obtain a GEF-wide understanding of the implementation progress and results of enabling activities.

✓ *Technical support*

53. The enabling activity projects allowed for an extensive use of national consultants originating mainly from academia or affiliated structures, NGOs, and government ministries. In situations of limited national capacities, countries sometimes expressed their need for international expertise. However, the budget limitations of the national enabling activity projects often prevented or limited countries from hiring international experts.

54. Where involved, international consultants contributed to providing technical backstopping support, as well as sharing and transferring experience and knowledge to the national

project staff. In general, recipient countries expressed a high level of satisfaction regarding the contribution of international experts.

55. The opportunity to exchange information and experiences via the internet or during training workshops was also perceived by the countries as one of the most valuable means for enhancing their capacities. However, because of budget and time constraints, expedited climate change enabling activity projects did not place much emphasis on these types of activities.

56. Many countries reported frustration at the lack of materials and softwarefor carrying out technical studies, or lack of resources to acquire them, particularly those related to projections and modeling.

57. In view of countries' requests for additional assistance, UNDP took the leading role in preparing a first proposal of the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP).[19] This program was jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP, and aimed at meeting the additional technical assistance needs of the countries and identifying the most appropriate remedial actions to the obstacles encountered by non-Annex I parties during the implementation of the enabling activity projects. During the last year, participating countries have recognized the positive results of the NCSP as having at least partly offset the gaps of national enabling activity projects in terms of technical assistance, although program execution only started in 1999, while national enabling activity projects began in 1995. However, the NCSP is close to completion while country needs for technical assistance, information exchange, networking, etc., are still increasing and evolving. Moreover, the NCSP has accumulated very valuable information and experience related to the crucial issues associated with enabling activity projects and the preparation of the national communication. All this "capital" will be lost unless the project continues.

58. While the NCSP is filling an essential role, the review found that the collaboration between UNDP and UNEP was not perfect, and that the quality of the support provided to enabling activity projects would be considerably improved if closer coordination of project activities could be established between the two agencies.

59. The review noted that there was no systematic peer-review process of technical reports prepared under the enabling activity projects, despite the need expressed by countries for such assistance. In some cases, UNDP did provide such technical assistance through the NCSP, much to the satisfaction of the recipient countries. In addition, UNEP took the lead in establishing technical review requirements for sectoral reports within the context of enabling activities, though it was not included as a requirement in any of the project documents. Initially, UNEP provided technical reviews to countries using in-house expertise and later encouraged the national project coordinators to seek external reviews within the existing national budgets. UNEP also provided names of potential reviewers and advice concerning their suitability within the individual context.

❒ *RECOMMENDATIONS*

60. With the experience already acquired by all the partners in the enabling activity process, enabling activities are expected to face fewer difficulties in the future. However, the review recommends that the duration of future enabling

19 This review does not intend to evaluate the NCSP, an independent evaluation is being undertaken for that purpose. The terms of reference of the review included an item relating to the role of the NCSP in providing appropriate assistance to countries to address identified gaps in the enabling activity projects. Therefore, it was important to the review to assess to what extent these gaps have been filled

activity projects be extended to 2.5 years[20] if the project focuses solely on the preparation of national communication, and 3-3.5 years if additional activities such as public awareness, policy integration, or other aspects of capacity building are emphasized.

61. The review also recommends that additional resources be made available for enhancing the capacity building component of enabling activity projects. This could be done by providing the enabling activity projects with the opportunity to enhance exchanges of information and experience through, for instance, the participation of country representatives in international seminars and workshops, as well as the broadening of technical training to different groups of participants.

62. Since the issue of unfair competition between the Implementing Agencies may arise again in the future, the review recommends that the roles and collaborative practices of the Implementing Agencies in climate change enabling activity projects be better defined. The GEF Secretariat can contribute to strengthening the collaborative spirit and helping ensure consistent application of the guidelines across the agencies. Moreover, the GEF Secretariat can also contribute to stimulating synergies between the projects by maintaining a transparent and accessible information system and keeping track of all enabling activity projects from the beginning of the design process.

63. This review finds that implementation supervision at both UNDP and UNEP has room for improvement. For example, the review noted that where strong and very qualified support was provided by the UNDP country offices, the enabling activity projects were generally very successful. Therefore, the review recommends that UNDP explore ways and means to provide country offices with greater technical expertise.

64. This review also recommends that UNEP strengthen the use of the quarterly report for supervision purposes and develop a regular system of visits to countries. A means of ensuring greater and more regular interaction with the UNDP country offices, when relevant, should also be developed.

65. In addition, the review recommends that the GEF establish an annual stock-taking review of enabling activities, in order to obtain an institution-wide understanding of the performance of these projects and improve overall management.

66. Regarding the technical assistance provided by international consultants, the review recommends that national enabling activity projects should have access to additional resources allowing countries to resort to such international expertise when appropriate.

67. Furthermore, in order to provide continuous backstopping and technical assistance to projects, the review recommends that UNDP and UNEP expand the practice of hiring competent regional experts, or supporting regional centers of excellence, to assist recipient countries in addressing technical enabling activity-related issues, particularly through peer-reviewing of project documents.

68. In terms of additional assistance and support needed by the countries, while it the role of the independent evaluation of the NCSP that is being undertaken to provide a comprehensive assessment of the NCSP's performance, this review sees merits in the continuation of the NCSP, given its critical

---

20 It should be noted that the frequency of the preparation of national communications by non-Annex I parties has yet to be decided by the COP. This recommendation is therefore relevant provided that it is consistent with the COP decision.

contribution to supporting the enabling activity program as a whole.

69. In light of the challenges associated with access to software, the review recommends that the GEF and the Implementing Agencies explore the various possibilities and mechanisms through which countries could better access essential software, as well as any associated documentation and necessary training.

PROJECT RESULTS

❒ *FINDINGS*

✓ *Stakeholder participation*

70. The review finds that major obstacles for the enabling activity projects were associated with the establishment of institutional arrangements, coordination among the different ministries involved, awareness raising among policymakers, and a lack of motivation among government representatives to contribute significantly to the studies and to report to their hierarchy. As a result, project steering committees often functioned in an isolated manner.

71. The review also notes the weaknesses of project documents regarding institutional strengthening[21] on climate change matters, in general, and on enabling activities, in particular due to inadequate resource allocations and inappropriate activities for achieving these goals. Thus, countries had limited motivation to sustain the institutional arrangements established during the course of the enabling activity projects, including, for instance, keeping the job responsibilities of trained staff similar or even vaguely related to climate change issues.

72. The experience with participation by civil society in enabling activity projects varied considerably. For instance, the involvement of experts from universities and academic institutions was, in most cases, essential for project progress. On the other hand, in the regional/global enabling activity projects, the NGOs often played a critical role, in the steering committees as well as in participating in the various activities of the projects. Regarding the national enabling activity projects, NGO involvement was mostly effective, however there were also instances of weak or partial participation. In addition, with the exception of consulting firms, the participation of the private sector was weak and usually nonexistent.

✓ *Integration of Climate Change Concerns and Results into Planning Activities*

73. The review finds that the enabling activity projects placed unrealistic expectations on such challenging objectives as integration of climate change concerns and results into the development activities of recipient countries, particularly with the limited timeframe given. In addition, the enabling activity projects also placed little emphasis and support on awareness raising activities and information exchange among and within governmental agencies.

✓ *Capacity building*

74. The enabling activity projects have contributed significantly towards enhancing the scientific and technical knowledge in countries, and to developing new methodologies for addressing climate change. Despite these results, many countries have expressed concerns about the sustainability of the process —once the projects complete implementation,

21 For instance, by permanently establishing a key climate change specialist or group in each national institution involved in the enabling activity project.

countries are not sure how to keep the teams in place for the preparation of the subsequent national communications. These concerns were addressed by COP decision 2/CP.4, to which the GEF Council responded to by approving additional funding for further supporting capacity building needs in priority areas.[22] While the financing granted through top-up funding will likely contribute to maintaining the climate change process, it represents only an interim solution until a more long term mechanism is defined.

✓ *Documentary products*

75. While in many cases, the quality of some technical reports was highly satisfactory, countries have generally faced serious difficulties in this area. Among the factors affecting the quality of the documents, three were identified as critical: (i) uncertainties associated with the quality of the basic data, or difficulties in obtaining them; (ii) insufficient training or fading out of knowledge gained from training; and (iii) absence of internal and external peer review of documents produced.

76. Many countries have indicated a need to enhance data reliability through more systematic data collection efforts. This was, for example, a major constraint in conducting a sound vulnerability assessment in many countries. In particular, the review notes the need and importance of allocating significantly more resources to assisting countries in assessing the impacts of climate change, and to design cost-effective adaptation response measures. The majority of developing countries, in their comments to reviewers, expressed the need to prioritize work on vulnerability assessment recognizing the relative dearth of detailed information concerning the impact of climate change on water resources, food security and other sectors in developing countries.

77. Resource and time constraints, as well as weak institutional motivation, posed critical barriers towards achieving these objectives during the implementation of enabling activity projects. Other common issues include a lack of long-term capacity building in appropriate institutions and insufficient infrastructure, such as monitoring stations for systematic observation and early warning systems.

78. Development of projects for abatement or adaptation options is an obvious follow-up of enabling activity projects. However, this is not allowed by the *Guidelines* despite UNDP's arguments in favor of developing abatement and adaptation project proposals as a part of the enabling activity projects. Though some good examples of investment actions have emerged from enabling activities[23] enabling activity projects have not explicitly addressed concrete investment activities, and the GEF has not made yet significant steps towards clarifying this issue;[24] though many countries expressed their views about this to the SBI.[25]

---

22 *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedure for Enabling Activity Projects – Part II* included a budget ceiling amounting to US$ 100,000. Guidelines for the use of these funds, however, are not clearly established.

23 E.g. ALGAS, PICCAP, Lebanon, Philippines, Thailand, etc.

24 The clarification concerns, for instance, the mechanisms by which countries could proceed with project proposals to further develop the *abatement/adaptation* options identified in their national communications.

25 The document FCCC/SBI/1999/8 included the following statement on page 14: "*(c) On the basis of views expressed by Parties, the SBI noted the information contained in document FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.4 and recommended that the "list of projects submitted by Parties not included in Annex I to the convention, in accordance with Article 12.4 of the Convention", contained in that document should be brought to the attention of GEF and, as appropriate, other bilateral and multilateral financing institutions through the established channels for such assistance.*"

✓ *Outreach, information dissemination and exchange*

79. Websites represent a cost-effective and efficient tool for meeting Convention requirements. While several countries had the option of developing websites, only a few projects have made provisions to accomplish this. Furthermore, most of the sites that were designed contain little useful information and are not regularly maintained or enhanced. In fact, most sites were suspended at the end of the enabling activity project. In addition, enabling activity projects have rarely utilized the media for information dissemination and public awareness.

✓ *Implementation of Regional/Global Climate Change Enabling Activities*

80. In addition to the national enabling activity projects, 10 regional/global enabling activity projects were initiated by the GEF. Though they started almost from scratch, these projects have achieved satisfactory results, particularly in relation to the four main focus areas: (i) building capacities; (ii) enhancing information exchange; (iii) establishing and maintaining networks; and (iv) building public awareness.

81. However, the regional/global projects also had some major weaknesses in terms of their country-driveness, which negatively affected the ownership of project results. In general, the global projects did not involve the recipient countries in the decision making process during project design and implementation, and the management approach of the regional projects lacked broad participation and information sharing.

82. The countries also felt that the regional/global projects put too much emphasis on meeting international commitments or regional concerns, at the expense of national priorities. In some cases, the regional/global projects relied too heavily on international consultancy companies or individuals. This generated frustration and compounded the weak ownership of the regional/global projects by the participating countries.

83. In addition, countries also felt that they were penalized for their participationin regional/global projects. These countries often experienced a dramatic drop in the budget allocation for their national enabling activity project as soon as it was made clear that they had previously participated in a regional/global project. This situation has led to countries having a certain aversion to participating in a regional/global project.

❒ ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

84. In order to enhance and sustain the institutional arrangements of the enabling activity projects, and to ensure an appropriate integration of climate change concerns into planning activities, a number of major recommendations can be made:

- Secure strong involvement (not simply an endorsement) at the highest ministerial and political level.
- Emphasize public-awareness activities in enabling activity projects directed towards decision and policy makers. Appropriate materials should be specifically developed by the enabling activity projects for this purposes.
- Encourage the establishment of climate change departments or centers to ensure the continuity of climate change studies, as well as follow-up actions.
- Encourage the establishment or the enhancement of National Climate Change Committees by providing them with official recognition and entrusting them with broad climate change-related responsibilities.

85. The review also recommends that the national climate change enabling activity projects improve the emphasis on NGO and private sector participation in the steering committees and in the different project activities, with a particular emphasis on awareness raising. In addition, linkages between projects should be developed in a more systematic manner.

86. Most countries view the creation of a national database as essential to maintaining capacity and ensuring the continuity of the preparation of the national communication. In that respect, the review recommends that enabling activity projects provide for a well established institutional framework with appropriate regulatory tools and incentives.

87. It is critical that the GEF launches regional projects aimed at improving emission factors and activity data, and establish an effective process for enhancing experience sharing among regions.

88. It is also recommended that the GEF allocate more significant resources to assisting countries in undertaking national climate change impact assessments, and to designing relevant adaptation responses. With respect to follow-up actions, it is recommended that the GEF and its Implementing Agencies establish a closer dialogue process with the countries in order to identify their expectations and prepare the appropriate framework towards responding to their needs and priorities.

89. Regarding capacity building, a more strategic and long-term approach for enabling activities should be established by GEF in the future. In that respect, it is recommended that the COP provide clear guidance on the scope of the capacity building aspect of the enabling activities. Respective roles of the national enabling activity projects and regional/global ones should also be well defined.

90. The review recommends that enabling activity projects give better support to the development of websites by granting the necessary resources for (i) the development of sites; (ii) the enhancement of sites by including all climate change-related information; and (iii) the regular updating of information contained in these sites.

91. In order to strengthen public awareness, the review also recommends that enabling activity projects give a more active role to journalists in the different workshops and meetings held by the projects.

92. Concerning the regional/global projects, in order to enhance country-drivenness and ownership, the projects should concretely involve the recipient countries in the decision making and management processes. In addition, priority should be given to the use of national and regional consultants, or to systematically associate international, regional and national consultants.

93. There is an inherent risk of harmful competition between national enabling activity projects and regional/global projects. In order to strengthen the synergies and complementarity between these two types of projects, the review finds it necessary to better differentiate the roles and the objectives of these types of projects. For example, regional/global projects could focus on information exchange and network support, capacity building and training, development of methodologies, etc. The national projects, in turn, could focus on the preparation of national documents relevant to the UNFCCC.

II. COP Guidance and GEF Responses

Elements of COP guidance to the GEF relevant to enabling activities

94. The text of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was adopted at the United Nations Headquarters, New York on May 9, 1992; it was open for signature at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro from June 4-14, 1992, and thereafter at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from June 20, 1992 to June 19, 1993. By that date the Convention had received 166 signatures. The Convention entered into force on March 21, 1994.

95. Article 21 of the Convention, "Interim Arrangements," entrusted the operation of the financial mechanism, referred to in Article 11 of the Convention, to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on an interim basis.[26] The UNFCCC Conference of the Parties on its First Session (COP1) held in Berlin during March–April 1995 decided "that the restructured GEF shall continue, on an interim basis, to be the international entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism..."[27] In providing guidance to the GEF on funding, COP1 directed the GEF to give priority to the support of national communications referred to in Article 12.1 of the Convention (Box 1).[28] COP1 also requested "the subsidiary bodies to develop for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its second session, recommendations on guidelines for the preparation of national communications."

Box 1: Guidance to the GEF from COP 1 - Decision 11/CP.1

Para. b (i): Priority should be given to the funding of agreed full costs (or agreed full incremental costs, as appropriate) incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.1 and other relevant commitments under the Convention. In the initial period, emphasis should be placed on enabling activities undertaken by developing country Parties, such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures.

96. The Conference of the Parties, at its Second Session (COP2) in July 1996, adopted detailed guidelines for the content of the first national communications from non-Annex I

26 The GEF at this time was in its pilot phase, and in entrusting the GEF with the operation of the financial mechanism on an interim basis, Article 21, para.3 of the Convention said that "the Global Environment Facility should be appropriately restructured and its membership made universal to enable it to fulfil the requirements of Article 11."

27 Decision 9/CP.1, FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1, *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its First Session. Held at Berlin from 28 March to 7 April 1995*, Addendum, Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties at its First Session.

28 Decision 11/CP.1, item b(i) in FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1 *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its First Session, Held at Berlin from 28 March to 7 April 1995*, Addendum, Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties at its First Session.

Box 2: Guidance to the GEF from COP2 – Decision 11/CP.2

Para.1(a) In the initial period, implement strategies on enabling activities in accordance with decision 11/CP.1, which facilitate endogenous capacity-building, including data collection and archiving, consistent with the policy guidance, programme priorities and eligibility criteria provided to it by the Conference of Parties.

Para.1(c): Together with its Implementing Agencies, **expedite the approval and the disbursement of financial resources** to meet the agreed full costs incurred by the developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.1 of the Convention, in accordance with Article 4.3, and in particular for the initial and subsequent preparation of national communications of non-Annex I Parties. In this regard, the guidelines and format adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its second session on the preparation of initial national communications by non-Annex I Parties contained in decision 10/CP.2 shall form the basis for the funding of communication from non-Annex I Parties under Article 12.1 of the Convention.

Para.1(d) Consider country-specific needs and other approaches which may be used for several countries with similar needs, upon request, and take into account that the preparation of national communications is a continuing process.

Parties.[29] In its guidance to the GEF COP2 reiterated the necessity of meeting the 11/CP.1 requirements and confirmed that these guidelines and format would form the basis for the funding of communications from non-Annex I Parties.

97. At the Fourth Conference of the Parties (COP4), held in Buenos Aires from November 2-14, 1998, guidance to the GEF emphasized the need for funding support for preparing initial and subsequent national communications "by maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacity" (Box 3). COP4 also made a provision for non-Annex I Parties to communicate their issues and concerns regarding initial communications to the attention of the GEF and its Implementing Agencies (see Box 4).

Box 3: Guidance to the GEF from COP 4 – Decision 2/CP.4

Para.1(d): Meet the agreed full costs of preparing initial and subsequent national communications, in accordance with Articles 4.3 and 12.5 of the Convention and decision 11/CP.2 para.1(d), by maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacity, so as to prepare the initial and second national communications which will take into account experiences, including gaps and problems identified in previous national communications, and guidelines established by the Conference of the Parties. Guidance on subsequent national communications will be provided by the Conference of the Parties.

29 Decision 10/CP.2, *Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention*; guidelines, facilitation and process for consideration, in document FCCC/CP/1996/15/Add.1 *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Second Session*, Geneva, 8-19 July 1996, *Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties at its Second Session*

Box 4: Guidance to the GEF from COP 4 – Decision 12/CP.4

Para 1(d) To ensure that issues and concerns identified by non-Annex I Parties in their initial communications are brought to the attention of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and, through it, as appropriate, its implementing Agencies, when undertaking the comprehensive review of enabling activities projects.

GEF Response to Guidance from the COP

98. In response to guidance from COP1, the GEF developed *Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities: Climate Change* during 1995-1996. The overall objective in developing the criteria was to establish an expedited approval process within the GEF with approval delegated to the GEF Chairman/ CEO. It should be noted that even while the criteria were being developed, the GEF approved enabling activities for Jordan (October 1995), Uruguay (November 1995), Armenia (December 1995), Argentina (January 1996), and Egypt (April 1996), following the procedures of the GEF project cycle.

99. The *Criteria* was developed in conjunction with the Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat. It was presented as an information document to the GEF Council during its meeting on 2-4 April, 1996, and it set out criteria for enabling activities related to national communications.[30] The *Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities: Climate Change* contained six annexes.[31] Since the guidelines for national communications by non-Annex I Parties were still under development by the COP, the criteria were proposed on an interim basis, and based broadly on the requirements of Article 12.1, "taking into account the common, but differentiated responsibilities of countries."[32] The intention was to revise the criteria once the guidelines for the non-Annex I national communications had been approved by the COP.

100. There were four criteria for accessing GEF funding for enabling activity projects[33] (i) Coverage without duplication (ii) Appropriate overall sequencing of activities (iii) Good practice and (iv) Cost effectiveness

101. The *Operational Criteria* was developed by the GEF Secretariat, in consultation with the three Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat. In developing the *Criteria*, the GEF looked for guidance to past experience with the design of earlier enabling activities, such as the U.S. Country Studies Program and similar efforts supported by other donors.

102. The process of responding to the COP guidance involved the GEF Secretariat, the three Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat. The first draft of the *Criteria* was

30 Enabling activities not related to national communications were not covered by the *Criteria*; these activities were to be prepared and assessed in the context of GEF Operational Programs.

31 Refer to Annex 7.

32 GEF Council information paper, GEF/C.7/inf.10, *Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities, Climate Change*.

33 Refer to Annex 6 for more detailed explanations of the four criteria.

prepared by the GEF Secretariat and circulated to the other agencies for comments. After a number of rounds of comments, the GEF Secretariat issued the final version of the *Criteria*, and transmitted it to the GEF Council for approval. It should be noted that no direct consultations with the countries were undertaken when adopting these guidelines. The review also received mixed feedback regarding incorporation of the views of the GEF partners[34] by the GEF Secretariat into the final version of the *Criteria*.

103. One of the major issues of debate during the development of the *Operational Criteria* was the extent of capacity building that should be supported under enabling activity projects. One view was that capacity building was needed only to the extent required to prepare the initial national communications, while the countervailing view was that capacity building should be established to help countries move beyond the initial communications and gear up for developing policies and strategies required to deal with climate change. In the end, a compromise was reached, whereby capacity building under the initial communications was interpreted as not just the minimum required for preparing initial communications, but as a first step in an evolving process of capacity enhancement for countries to meet their obligations under the Convention.[35]

104. Following the COP2 issuance of guidelines for the preparation of initial communication by non-Annex I Parties in February 1997, the GEF issued new *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from Non-Annex I Parties*. The *Operational Guidelines* contained six explanatory Annexes.[36]

105. The major improvement in the 1997 guidelines was that the activity matrix and the cost norms were now very clearly tied to the guidelines for national communications approved by COP2.[37]

106. In response to guidance from COP4, the GEF decided that a medium to long term action plan should be developed to meet the capacity building needs of the countries, beyond the priority of the preparation of the initial national communication. In May 1999, the GEF Council approved a "Capacity Development Initiative" (CDI)[38] aimed at developing such an action plan.

---

34 UNDP, UNEP, The World Bank and the UNFCCC Secretariat.

35 In establishing an overall limit of US$350,000 for enabling activities under expedited procedures, the GEF seems to have been guided by the precedence established and endorsed by the GEF Council for approval of Project Development Funds-Block B (PDF-B) of up to US$350,000 by the GEF CEO. When defining the cost norms, the GEF consulted also with representatives of similar enabling activity programs, in particular USCSP, GTZ, UCCEE, etc.

36 Refer to Annex 8.

37 Refer to the table included in Annex 5 for a comparison of the cost norms between the 1996 Criteria and the 1997 Guidelines.

38 The Capacity Development Initiative is a strategic partnership with UNDP to develop a strategic, cost-effective and Convention-responsive framework for capacity building in the global environment. Refer to GEF Council Paper GEF/C/13/9, May 5-9, 1999.

107. The GEF Council also approved *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedures- Part II*[39] in October 1999, which aimed at supporting interim measures for capacity building in priority areas of non-Annex I countries, as identified by Decision 2/CP.4. As a result, eligible countries may seek up to US$100,000 of GEF funding support for that purpose. Each country may flexibly allocate the requested amount to the following activities, according to its preferences: (i) Identification/submission of technology needs; (ii) Capacity building for participation in systematic observation networks; (iii) Improvement of emission factors; (iv) Maintenance and enhancement of national capacities to prepare national communications; (v) Developing/strengthening/improving national activities for public awareness and education, and access to information.

Assessment of the GEF Response

108. The GEF response to COP1 guidance took one year. While the elapsed time seems long, it should be kept in mind that developing expedited procedures was a novel experience for the GEF. In addition, the operationalization of COP guidance was not an easy task, since the COP decision tended to cover a large number of issues at once, leaving room for divergent interpretations.[40] Debates and discussions on the level of capacity building to be supported through enabling activities were of critical importance and took considerable time before final resolution. While the US$350,000 ceiling may appear ad-hoc, the precedence established through the same ceiling for PDF-B for delegated CEO approval seems to have paved the way for the GEF Council to approve the *Criteria* with a great deal of comfort.

109. The *Operational Criteria* issued in 1996 was based broadly on the requirements of Article 12.1 of the Convention. This was a pragmatic approach given the pressure to provide financial resources to countries to start preparing enabling activities.[41] After COP2 adopted detailed guidelines for initial communications in July 1996, the GEF issued the revised *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from Non-Annex I Parties* in February 1997, taking into account the COP guidelines.

110. This review finds that the scope of capacity building under enabling activity projects was not very clearly defined, partly reflecting the early debates and attempts at compromise during the development of the criteria and guidelines. It was more than the minimum required for initial communications, but is not a clear step in the direction of sustainable capacity building for handling climate change issues. However, in practice, as soon as the national communication was

39 *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Climate Change Enabling Activities - Part II*: Expedited Financing for (Interim) Measures for Capacity Building in Priority Areas.

40 Refer in particular to Para (b)(i - iv) of decision 11/CP.1 (included in Annex 9 of this document) where some lack of precision might have paved the way for divergent interpretations. For instance, para (ii), (iii), (iv) might be interpreted as priorities for enabling activities, while some may consider them secondary compared to other more national communication-related activities. Moreover, the last sentence of para (b)(iv) has a large scope of activities with expressions such as "*which should, as far as possible, be comprehensive*" that may lead to considerably divergent interpretations.

41 As mentioned earlier, the GEF had provided financing to five countries prior to April 1996. During April 1996-February 1997, the GEF provided support to an additional 14 countries.

identified as the main objective of enabling activity projects, particularly those implemented under expedited procedures, the GEF guidelines adequately responded to the COP guidance, particularly with regards to the content of the national communication. In fact, the guidelines represent a base document complete and explicit enough to take into account the COP decisions and, at the same time, allow the countries to meet their reporting commitments under the UNFCCC. Thus, despite some uncertainty regarding the primary role of enabling activities, the GEF response to COP1 and COP2 guidance, on the whole, is judged to have been pragmatic and timely

111. The GEF response to COP4 guidance took one year. The imprecise wording of the COP guidance has been partly responsible for this delay, through misleading linkages with the initial national communication as a basis to identify country needs, and reference to expected new guidelines for subsequent national communications to be vaguely provided later on by the COP. As an interim mechanism, the GEF established these guidelines to respond to the short-term needs of the countries until appropriate recommendations emerge from the CDI;[42] and new guidelines for the subsequent national communications for non-Annex I Parties are agreed upon, possibly during COP7. Again, however, the review finds that the GEF guidelines were a pragmatic response to the COP guidance.

112. The new guidelines provide much more flexibility for countries to use funds allocated according to the priorities expressed in their initial communication. The final project and budget will be based on a discussion between the recipient country and the GEF implementing agency. However, the ambiguity of these new guidelines may lead to major misinterpretation by non-Annex I Parties, as well as by the Implementing Agencies. In fact, the review finds that some critical criteria for accessing to this fund could be made more explicit, including:

- Is the eligibility for this top-up funding conditioned by the completion of the initial national communication?
- What about the eligibility of the countries that have previously benefited from a non-expedited enabling activity project?
- What is the exact meaning of paragraph 11 regarding the funding limits?
- Are countries allowed to allocate the full budget to a single item?

113. Several countries expressed concerns about the operationalization of these guidelines. As of July 2000, 26 project proposals were received by the GEF Secretariat, and 22 were approved by CEO.

114. Regarding the response to Decision 12/CP.4, the terms of reference for this review directed the review team to take into account "Views expressed by the Parties through the Convention Process." This review has done that based on documents received from the Parties through the UNFCCC Secretariat.[43]

---

42 The CDI is still ongoing, and an assessment of the CDI is not under the scope of this review. Thus, no judgment could be made on the effectiveness of the GEF response to COP guidance in this area.

43 FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.10. Refer to Annex 12 for a synthesis of Views expressed by Parties.

115. It should be noted that COP5 issued decision 8/CP.5, stating that *"all Parties that have submitted their initial national communications before the adoption of revised guidelines for national communications, and wish to start the preparation of their second national communications before the seventh session of the Conference of the Parties, may do so using the initial guidelines; that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) shall provide funding for the preparation of the second national communications of such Parties, following the guidance to the GEF set out in decisions 11/CP.2 and 2/CP.4; and that such Parties which start to prepare their second national communications after adoption of the revised guidelines shall use the revised guidelines."*[44]

116. In response, during May 2000, the GEF Council approved an approach employing the procedure and operational criteria used for the initial communications,[45] but with some modifications that are being developed: (i) inclusion of additional activities, if the country chooses, on the basis of decision 2/CP.4 to be reflected in a new activity matrix; and (ii) absence of prescribed cost-ranges for line items. As in the case of the CDI an assessment of the response to COP5 guidance is beyond the scope of this review.

44 FCCC/CP/1999/6/Add.1.

45 GEF/C.15/8, Annex B.

III. Effectiveness of Operational Guidelines

Interpretation of the Operational Guidelines

117. Despite the debate and eventual compromise on the scope of capacity building activities, the GEF guidelines reveal a special emphasis on activities that relate directly to the preparation of the initial communication. There was a particular effort to avoid duplication and to seek complementarity with activities previously undertaken by other initiatives, such as GEF regional/global projects or projects financed by other donors.[46]

118. Initially, there were conflicting interpretations of the GEF Guidelines between the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat, particularly in relation to issues that affect the level of funding, such as the level of support to be provided to capacity building and to activities that received parallel support from GEF or other donors. Eventually, however, a common ground was established, particularly with respect to the rapid preparation of the initial communications. Since climate change enabling activities deal with complex technical issues, the UNDP country offices, which were at the forefront of dealing with the countries, had to seek advice and guidance from UNDP HQ in interpreting the guidelines. This led, in some cases, to long negotiations between the countries, the UNDP and the GEF Secretariat which delayed the project approval process.

119. In addition, the recipient countries did not always interpret the guidelines and the COP guidance along the same lines as the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. For instance, several recipient countries expressed a need for higher funding support from the GEF, stressing their priority needs for: (i) capacity building; (ii) enhancement and improvement of the studies that were carried out previously; and (iii) launching of additional studies related to climate change aspects, in particular those addressing data collection process, as well as vulnerability and adaptation.

120. It should be also stressed that during the early learning phase, none of the key players (GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and the countries themselves), had a precise idea of specific country needs related to the national communications and of the most appropriate ways to meet these through GEF funding. It is only with the benefit of hindsight that the GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies have become more aware of the specific country needs. On their part, the countries now demonstrate better understanding and appreciation of the parameters associated with GEF financing of enabling activities.

Applicability and Flexibility to the Countries' Needs

121. The Activity Matrix,[47] included in the *Operational Guidelines*, helped project proponents identify and summarize the activities relevant to the preparation of initial national

46 Refer to "Coverage without duplication" in *Operational Criteria 1996*, and "Building upon existing activities and knowledge" in *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedures*, 1997.

47 Refer to Annex C of *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedures*, 1997.

communications previously carried out in the country. GEF support through enabling activity projects were designed to complement these activities in preparing the initial communication. While the identification of earlier activities that might be relevant to national communications was not an issue for the completion of the activity matrix, the review finds that *Operational Guidelines* placed a strong presumption on the success of these previous enabling activity initiatives, despite not having any objective assessment of these efforts.

122. The real content and quality of the products generated by these previous initiatives could not be appropriately and objectively assessed during the project design phase. In practice, countries found it difficult to justify their needs to undertake a given activity a second time, even in cases where such needs were legitimate. Given the pressure to prepare and implement enabling activity projects rather quickly, they were generally forced to accept the rules imposed by this matrix.

123. The level of funding was the most frequently debated issue during project negotiations between the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the countries. Differences in interpretation among the key players and some degree of competition between the two Implementing Agencies led to prolonged negotiations on certain projects. The emphasis on the level of funding rather than on technical matters has sometimes harmed the spirit of enabling activity portfolio development. Consequently, the review finds that greater precision in COP guidance and GEF guidelines could go a long way towards removing ambiguities associated with the definition and the finality of some terms (e.g. enabling activity, capacity building, etc.), and help in a more consistent application of the guidelines and cost norms among the Implementing Agencies.

124. It is also recommended that the GEF Secretariat improve the consultative process for the formulation of the next GEF guidelines for enabling activity projects. This process should allow for a more equitable role for the Implementing Agencies in the finalization of the guidelines and a more collaborative spirit between them. In addition, the process of preparing the guidelines should better take the countries' needs and interests into account and not only lay emphasis on their obligations[48]. In this context, it is suggested that the GEF partners explore adequate ways and means for involving a group of technical experts from the recipient countries in these consultations.

EFFECTS OF EXPEDITED PROCEDURES ON PROJECT PROCESSING

125. Theoretically, countries could, if they wished, request more than US$ 350,000 of GEF support for enabling activity projects following the full project cycle procedure of the GEF. While 14 countries had already obtained funding for enabling activity projects under normal procedures before the new guidelines for expedited procedures were issued in February 1997, no single enabling activity project has been developed under the normal procedures of the GEF project cycle since that date. The disadvantage of this route compared to expedited procedures is that, because of the funding level, it requires GEF Council approval, and hence longer processing time. For instance, for the 14 existing non-expedited

48 Annex 10 presents some of the needs expressed by the recipient countries and their major priorities for the development of the future enabling activity projects.

projects it took an average of 456 working days between receipt of the project proposal at the GEF Secretariat to the first disbursement.

126. The logic behind introducing the expedited procedures for enabling activities was to develop a system whereby the GEF Council delegated approval authority for projects to the GEF CEO, provided the GEF funding requested was less than US$350,000 and the project design was according to guidelines/criteria acceptable to the Council. The overall objective was to reduce project processing time and provide timely resources to countries to meet their reporting obligations under the Convention. However, it should be noted that the expedited procedures focused only on one section of the project formulation cycle—from receipt of proposal at the GEF Secretariat to the approval by the GEF CEO, while the other sections of the project cycle were unaffected by this procedure.

127. An analysis was conducted of elapsed project processing time (number of workdays elapsed from date of receipt of the project proposal at the GEF unit of the Implementing Agency to the date of project start in the country) for projects under expedited procedures. Figure 1 depicts the average elapsed time on a yearly basis. During the period 1995-1998, there was a significant decrease (60%) in the amount of time taken to process a project—from an average of 499 days in 1995 to an average of 188 days in 1998. The decrease of the elapsed time mostly occurred in the early stages (i.e. 35 % occurred during the period 1995-1996), with the initial introduction of expedited procedures. In 1997, the decrease in elapsed time was more modest (16%), while in 1998, a considerable effort was made and the elapsed time decreased by 31% relative to 1997.

128. Despite the significant decrease in processing time under expedited procedures, it is difficult to confirm whether the expedited procedures have actually reduced processing times in relation to non-expedited procedures. A small sample size of projects under non-expedited procedures, all undertaken early on

Fig. 1 Average Total Elapsed Time for Project Preparation (expedited procedures)



	1995	1996	1997	1998
Average	499	324	272	188
Median	537	316	260	169
Number of Projects	7	26	31	8

Note: Total elapsed time is the number of working days between receipt of a proposal at the IA-GEF unit in the country to the date of project start in the country. The chart was prepared using a total sample of 72 projects in the portfolio for which the relevant dates were available.

in the enabling activity portfolio development (i.e. 1995-96) make comparisons with the expedited procedures impossible.

129. In order to identify bottlenecks in the processing cycle for expedited projects, an analysis was also conducted of the elapsed times between major milestones in the enabling activity projects cycle. The analysis reviewed the whole period from 1995-98.[49] In this sample, about 77% of the time spent between the first and third milestones of the project cycle[50] was spent in processing within the Implementing Agency. It is in these three milestones that the most significant decrease in total elapsed time has been made over time.[51] On the other hand, the fourth and the fifth milestones represent 37% of the project processing for the whole period 1995-98, and these are where no improvements at all were made across the years,[52] and thus where there are still important opportunities for future improvement.

130. Overall, this review finds that the elapsed time for processing enabling activity projects under expedited processes is still too long,[53] and that there is room for reducing it further. For instance, UNDP has made efforts to remove the bottlenecks affecting the project processing cycle over the past five years. However, the elapsed time for project processing by UNDP should be shortened even further in order to expedite implementation.[54] But any future reduction in processing time needs to be weighed carefully in light of the recommendations for broader stakeholder consultation.

131. Given the quick evolution of the climate change process, and the evolving needs of the countries, the challenge for future GEF enabling activity initiatives is to react rapidly to changing circumstances. Therefore, additional efforts are required by the GEF to further streamline this processing. Also, the countries should facilitate the process of stakeholder consultations, negotiations with the Implementing Agencies, signature and project approval, and remove the administrative barriers that significantly hamper project approval and implementation.

---

49 Note: Linkages of these analysis with figure 1 should be made cautiously. Figure 1 has a sample size of 72, while because of a lack of data (or reliable data) for the different stages of project processing, the analysis conducted in this paragraph and the following ones are based on a smaller sample size of 43 projects. However, the structure of the two samples across the agencies and across the years is almost similar. Also the years 1996 and 1997 represent 79% of the population for both the two samples, though the 43 projects sample slightly under represents the year 1996.

50 Five main milestones were identified at the project processing level: (i) Request to IA to Receipt at GEFSEC; (ii) Receipt at GEFSEC to CEO approval; (iii) CEO approval to IA approval; (iv) IA approval to project start; and (v) project start to first disbursement.

51 For instance, there was a 41% decrease in the elapsed time within these three milestones between 1996 and 1997.

52 UNDP maintained that the longer time elapsed from CEO approval to IA approval in its projects is used to agree and specify financial and implementation arrangements among project partners.

53 For UNDP, for instance, several reasons explain delays affecting project starting, including rigidity of the modalities for the recruitment of consultants as well as for the approval modalities of quarterly financial reports and budget advances requests, etc. In addition, UNDP argues that their concerns for financial accountability and control explains the delay in this stage of the project cycle.

54 Associated difficulties at the country level should also be mentioned: appointment of the national execution agency, appointment of national project coordinator, opening of a bank account for the projects, preparation of a work and budget plan to conform to the requirements of the project document and UNDP/UNEP regulations.

Disbursement issues

132. In order to facilitate prompt commencement of project implementation, the GEF made a decision to proceed with an immediate 15% disbursement to the enabling activity project once approved by the GEF CEO. However, it should be noted that this decision could not be implemented because the rules of the Implementing Agencies do not allow for any disbursement prior to signature of the project document by the country.[55]

133. While some countries have complained of disbursement delays, the review found that these occurred in only a few instances and rarely affected project implementation.[56] Rather, more significant implementation delays have been caused by issues such as development of the budget and work plan, identification of consultants, and establishment of institutional arrangements.

Dissemination of operational guidelines

134. This review finds that most country representatives could access and were familiar with the GEF *Operational Guidelines*. In fact, the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Implementation Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat, had launched an outreach process through which the Parties were informed of the *Guidelines* and hard copies of the documents were distributed. In addition, the Implementing Agencies systematically transmitted the *Operational Guidelines* to the participating countries as soon as they began consultations to prepare enabling activity projects.

135. However, the review finds that the *Operational Guidelines* transmitted to the GEF focal points were not disseminated within countries, and the project design largely involved the concerned implementing agency and often a single national representative. Consequently, stakeholder participation during project design was very limited, and often prevented a more effective inclusion of sectoral concerns into project proposals. In practice, the urgency to prepare proposals prevented both the Implementing Agencies and their national counterparts from establishing a consultative process within countries during project preparation.

---

55 The project document represents a type of contract between the country and the implementing agency, and it defines the responsibilities and liabilities of each Party to this contract.

56 For instance, many UNDP country offices were asked by UNDP-New York to advance funds from their own budgets as soon as the project document was signed, in order to avoid any disbursement delay and allow for quick project starting.

IV. Portfolio Overview

Analysis of the Climate Change Enabling Activities Portfolio

136. The GEF *Operational Strategy* describes enabling activities as broad capacity building for non-Annex I countries: "enabling activities —which include inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and strategies and action plans—represent a basic building block of GEF assistance to countries. They either are a means of fulfilling essential communications requirements to a Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country. Countries thus enabled will have the ability to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs to address global environmental problems through a cost-effective approach within the context of national sustainable development efforts."[57]

137. The GEF focus on capacity building has existed since the earliest days of the pilot phase. Many enabling activity projects, though not directed explicitly towards the development of initial communications to the UNFCCC, were approved during the pilot phase. Several regional/global projects and full projects fall under this category. Following explicit guidance from COP1 and COP2, the GEF developed expedited procedures and guidelines to support enabling activities that were explicitly geared towards developing initial communications.

138. As of May 31, 2000, the GEF had approved climate change enabling activity projects in 132 countries totaling about US$72 million, of which:

(a) The largest amount of money—US$36 million (50% of the portfolio) was approved through 10 regional/global projects;

(b) 100 projects amounting to a total of US$25 million (35% of the portfolio) were approved following the *Operational Criteria* and expedited procedures;

(c) About US$11 million (15% of the portfolio) was allocated to 15 projects, approved following full project procedures.[58]

Table 1 depicts a synthesized overview of the GEF climate change enabling activity portfolio.

139. UNDP implements the vast majority of the enabling activity projects—two-thirds of the portfolio in terms of the share of funds approved. UNEP comes a far second with about one-fifth of the portfolio; the World Bank accounts for just 12% of the portfolio. UNDP also dominates the portfolio in the different modalities that were employed to support enabling activities. In that respect, UNDP accounts for:

57 *GEF Operational Strategy*, 1996, page 1.

58 These are projects that were approved either before the development of the *Operational Criteria* and expedited procedures or exceeded US$150,000 or funding request.

TABLE 1. GEF PORTFOLIO OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES

	UNDP	UNEP	World Bank	Total
Projects approved under expedited procedures				
Number of projects	77	22	1	100
Total Cost	$18,831,382	$6,041,700	$349,500	$25,222,582
Projects approved under full project review procedures				
Number of projects	14	0	1	15
Total Cost	$9,062,000	$0	$2,000,000	$11,062,000
Regional/Global Projects				
Number of Projects	6	3	1	10
Total Cost	$20,040,000	$9,700,000	$6,300,000	$36,040,000
Total Number of enabling activity Projects	**97**	**25**	**3**	**125**
TOTAL Cost for enabling activity projects	**$47,933,382**	**$15,741,400**	**$8,649,500**	**$72,324,282**

(a) More than half of the regional/global projects portfolio;

(b) Three-fourths of the funding allocated to expedited projects;

(c) 82% of the funding allocated to non-expedited projects.

BUDGET FOR ADMINISTRATION COSTS

140. The components of budget support received by the Implementing Agencies from the GEF Secretariat for managing climate change enabling activities are summarized in Table 2. Information on amounts provided

FIG. 2: SHARE OF GEF-FUNDED CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS AMONG THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES (%)



TABLE 2. ESTIMATED BUDGET SUPPORT TO THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES – EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

		World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	Total
1	GEF Corporate Budget	$12,877	$758,705	$157,606	$929,188
2	Agency Fees	$0	$615,402	$483,312	$1,098,714
3	Total Support to Implementing Agencies	$12,877	$1,374,107	$640,918	$2,027,902
4	Number of Climate Change Enabling Activities	1	77	22	100
5	Average Project Support (3/4)	$12,877	$17,846	$29,133	$20,279
6	Average GEF allocation per Enabling Activity	$349,500	$244,563	$274,809	$252,223
7	Average Project Support Rate (5/6)	4%	7%	11%	8%

Notes :

- Due to difficulties in separating the GEF budget corporate support that is specifically allocated to climate change enabling activity projects, this table presents only estimated figures. The estimates were made using a staff-week costing and some partial numbers of staff-week that are projected to be allocated to climate change enabling activity projects, as estimated by the implementing Agencies (refer to the footnote in the previous page). It should be noted that the estimates are a lower bound estimate, as no activity based resource provisions could be estimated from the FY96 and FY97 budgets.
- The Agency fees are estimated using the Agency fee rates of 3% and 8% for UNDP and UNEP respectively.
- It should be noted that this table includes only enabling activity projects processed under expedited procedures. To reflect the effective support that is provided to the Implementing Agencies for the enabling activity projects, some consideration should be given to the resources provided to UNDP through the NCSP. UNEP, on the other hand, does not receive any agency fee from NCSP.

through the GEF Corporate budget was provided by the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies, while the fees charged on a per project basis was supplied by the Implementing Agencies. The former amounts are provided to the Implementing Agencies directly from GEF Corporate budget while the latter are deducted from the countries' enabling activity grants.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT FROM THE CORPORATE BUDGET

141. It was not possible to obtain a clear estimate of the financial resources provided through the Corporate Budget for climate change enabling activities. Climate enabling activities, particularly those approved through expedited procedures, entered the GEF portfolio in fiscal year 1996. The GEF did not follow full activity based budgeting until fiscal year 1999, when 4.6 staff weeks (costed at $5,382 per staff week) was provided per enabling activity; there was only partial activity-based budgeting during fiscal year 1998.[59] These resources were provided to support the development, preparation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of enabling activities, including hiring regional coordinators and consultants (not consultants within countries, however, which were funded from the enabling activity grants). The estimates for GEF Corporate budget resources in Table 2 are thus only partial, and are lower

59 According to the GEF Corporate budget for FY98, UNDP provided 1.5 staffweeks per enabling activity project processing; UNEP estimated 2 staffweeks for the same activity; there are no coefficients for the World Bank implemented enabling activities. During this study, UNDP provided statistics claiming that a total of 103.5 staffweeks (costed at $4,724) and 216.2 staffweeks (costed at $5,382) were provided for enabling activities (both biodiversity and climate change) in fiscal years 1998 and 1999 respectively. This involves support to development and monitoring of 125 projects in FY98 and 165 projects in FY99.

bound estimate, as no activity based resource provisions could be estimated from the FY96 and FY97 budgets.

EXECUTING AGENCY FEES/ AGENCY SUPPORT COSTS

142. Each IA charges a different amount for "executing agency fees/agency support costs":

- The World Bank did not charge any fee.
- In the case of UNDP, when the project is under national execution, up to 3% is charged by the UNDP country offices for support/procurement services where requested.[60]
- UNEP charges 8% per enabling activity for execution by UNEP, from which 3% is provided to UNDP field offices if they are asked to assist in the implementation of the projects.[61]

OVERALL ANALYSIS OF THE BUDGET SUPPORT ISSUES

143. The estimated budgetary resources provided for enabling activities to the Implementing Agencies are judged to be inadequate, particularly for UNDP and the World Bank. This might have limited the capacity of the Implementing Agencies to provide relevant technical and supervision support.[62] The GEF seems to have recognized this weakness. Under the new fee-based system, the Implementing Agencies receive US$54,000 per enabling activity project towards administrative expenses covering the full project cycle.

60 If the project is executed by UNOPS, an 8% fee is charged. It should be noted that only four national climate change enabling activity projects were executed by UNOPS.

61 According to a United Nations General Assembly decision, UNEP charges 13% overhead on non-GEF projects that it implements.

62 Negotiations for a fee to the administrative budget of the Implementing Agencies for the up to $100,000 top-up for enabling activities are still under way.

V. Design and Implementation

Effectiveness in meeting the objectives set forth by the operational guidelines

144. The review finds that after a brief learning period, the *Operational Guidelines* rapidly became the basic reference document for the development of enabling activity project proposals. Enabling activity projects generally met the objectives set forth in the *Operational Guidelines*, with the following observations:

(a) "Country drivenness" of enabling activity projects were narrowly interpreted in terms of endorsement of projects by the national GEF operational focal points;

(b) There was a presumption regarding the success of previous/ongoing activities related to climate change in the country when determining the level of GEF support under enabling activity projects;

(c) While the cost norms, in general, adequately covered the activities necessary for preparing initial communications, they provided little flexibility;

(d) Given the limitations of funding and the project implementation period, several of the objectives of enabling activity projects, beyond the preparation of initial communications, were unrealistic.

145. Five principles have guided the design of enabling activity projects. The first principle, emphasizing a strong focus on the production of initial national communications;[63] was generally applied by the Implementing Agencies in accordance with GEF guidelines.[64] The second principle relates to the use of the guidelines as a basis for determining the activities to be included in the enabling activity projects. As a result of the near universal application of the guidelines by recipient countries and the Implementing Agencies, enabling activity projects were developed along very similar lines. Most projects contained, in a generic way, the following types of activities:

- Greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory;
- Vulnerability assessments, policy options for monitoring systems, and response strategies;
- Policy options to address GHG abatement strategies;
- Policy frameworks for implementing adaptation and abatement measures and response strategies;
- Capacity building to integrate climate change concerns into planning;

63 Para. 7 of *Operational Guidelines*: "Enabling Activities not related to national communication are not addressed in these operational guidelines."

64 In that respect, the design of enabling activity projects correctly responded to the COP guidance, which focused on providing priority support for the preparation of the initial national communication. However, the COP guidance also mentioned "*...and other relevant commitments under the Convention.*" but this seems to have been omitted by the GEF Guidelines.

- Efforts related to sustainable development, research, raising public awareness, etc.; and

- Provision of other information (e.g. identification of the technical and financial needs associated with proposed projects and response measures, material/ data relevant for the calculation of global GHG emission trends, financial and technological needs and constraints associated with the communication of information, etc.).

146. The third principle relates to the review of project proposals, which was to be made by the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat.[65] These reviews were supposed to ensure that a number of good practices were followed, including (i) Country drivenness; (ii) Use of established guidelines; (iii) Complementarities with existing activities; (iv) Appropriate sequencing of activities towards preparing initial communications; (v) Efficiency in the use of financial resources, with GEF financing for the agreed full cost being available for any eligible enabling activity; and (vi) Use of local and regional experts, wherever available and whenever possible.

147. There is room for improvement in the application of some of these good practices. For example, the country drivenness criteria simply consisted of asking the recipient country to endorse the project by transmitting a letter of support from the GEF operational focal point in the country to the GEF. Written endorsement is obviously a necessary, but not a sufficient, indication of country drivenness. A more balanced approach, with appropriate stakeholder consultations and an assessment of national priorities related to the preparation of the national communication, would enhance country drivenness.

148. The fourth principle is linked to the good practice of "Building Upon Existing Activities and Knowledge" through the use of the activity matrix as "*the basic building blocks of the enabling activity.*"[66] The purpose of this matrix is to identify and assess any relevant activities that the GEF and/or other funding bodies had previously supported, using information available from the CC:INFO data base,[67] with the assumption that "*these previous or ongoing enabling activities would have succeeded in providing sufficient capacity in the category they deal with.*" The role of the enabling activities would then be to support complementary activities which would support the preparation of the initial national communication. This rule was effectively applied by the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat, as recommended by the GEF guidelines. However, the assumption that these previous/ongoing enabling activities were successful might have been somewhat misplaced. Many of these efforts were not fully assessed and were rarely based on objective criteria such as the quality of technical outputs, level of national participation, country drivenness, sustainability of capacity building, institutional arrangements, endorsement of the results by the main stakeholders, etc.[68]

---

65 The STAP was also mentioned in the *Operational Guidelines* as one of the actors involved in the review of project proposals. However, this participation has not occurred given the limited funding levels provided for expedited projects.

66 *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from Non-Annex I Parties - Annex C:* The activity matrix.

67 This database was maintained at the time by the UNFCCC Secretariat.

68 Refer to additional analysis in section "*Applicability and Flexibility to the Countries' Needs*" in Chapter III.

149. The fifth principle is linked to the good practice of "Efficiency in Use of Resources" under which the GEF is expected to deliver support in an efficient manner. Annex D in the *Operational Guidelines* contains a table highlighting "Typical cost ranges for expedited processing of Initial National Communications proposals," which was generally used with the activity matrix during project design to define the funding allocated to each activity. In most cases, this principle was applied rigorously by the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat. While the cost norms, in general, adequately covered the activities necessary for preparation of the national communications, the norms also presented the countries with a *fait accompli*, providing little flexibility and no fungibility of funds. There is also a question as to whether these reference tables truly address the countries' expectations and priorities, and to what extent they resulted in frustration within the countries and affected the overall project results. In order to avoid any additional disappointment, COP guidance should be made more clear and the GEF guidelines more flexible in the future on these critical budgetary issues.

150. The operationalization of these five principles has worked well, with few exceptions. In practice, the Implementing Agencies have simply transmitted a copy of the *Operational Guidelines* to the national GEF operational focal point and, when available, an example of an enabling activity project initiated by another country that already went through the initial steps of project formulation and approval. The project design often skipped the project brief step, which was supposed to identify country needs, and jumped directly to the formulation of project proposals.[69] While this approach significantly shortened the design phase of the enabling activity projects, the trade-off was that it left little initiative to the countries to develop project proposals that would better conform to their particular needs. However, the review finds that this particular trade-off placed undue emphasis on the *obligations* of the countries (i.e. preparation of the national communication, minimization of the project's duration), at the expense of the country's own needs and priorities.

151. The enabling activity projects also focused on achieving other ambitious objectives, including sustainability of capacities, establishment of information collection and updating systems for GHG inventories, sustainability of institutional arrangements, and integration of climate change concerns into national development policies. Many of these objectives—particularly the last one—have not been satisfactorily completed in any country. Considering the limited funding allocations, short duration of the projects (one to two years), novelty of climate change issues in recipient countries, and the limited national capacities at the beginning of the process,[70] this review finds that the enabling activity projects had unrealistic expectations when setting such objectives.

152. During the project implementation phase, some flexibility was given to the countries in making adjustments to their initial budgetary allotments. In fact, the Implementing Agencies usually approved requests for budget revisions made by the countries, provided that Implementing Agencies were consulted and involved in the decision and that the suggested

69 Some projects were largely inspired by project documents developed in other countries, using for the sake of simplification, a "cookie-cutter" approach.

70 Depending on the situation, "Limited national capacities" may imply a lack of competence in specific climate change-related fields and/or an inability for the most capable staff to dedicate their time to climate change issues at the expense of other priority tasks.

revisions fit into the project objectives and scope. In practice, project coordinators have requested only minor shifts between budget lines and activity plans when compared to the original budget that was defined by the project documents.[71] While most coordinators might have appreciated additional flexibility and possible fungibility between budget lines, they were willing to implement the project within the constraints of the budget initially approved.[72]

153. To summarize, the review recommends that: (i) a more balanced approach, with appropriate stakeholder participation and consultation and an assessment of national priorities be part of the "country drivenness" of project proposals; (ii) a fuller assessment of the quality of climate change related activities previously undertaken be factored into the context when finalizing the level of GEF support; (iii) more flexibility is provided in the use of agreed resources within the project context; and (iv) countries and the GEF be more focused and realistic when setting project objectives and expectations, given the available funding and time horizon.

EFFICIENCY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN CYCLE

154. Based on the statistics provided by UNDP and UNEP, the review finds that the total elapsed time from the first receipt of the project proposal at the Implementing Agency-GEF unit to the date of project start is still too long, despite the implementation of expedited procedures: 188 working days in 1998. While recognizing that a participatory approach and stakeholder consultations should be encouraged and take time, a long period of project processing may negatively affect the quality of the final projects, since several elements of the project document initially defined may not be relevant for the country when finally implemented. In addition, the countries as well as the GEF may have new COP guidance to address. Refer to Chapter III for a detailed analysis of project processing elapsed times.

155. While each of the main players (Implementing Agencies, GEF Secretariat, the countries) are partly responsible for the excessive elapsed time during different stages of project design and processing, some of these delays can be attributed to a necessary learning period in the implementation of COP guidance —compounded by a lack of clarity in COP guidance—and different interpretations of the GEF guidelines. In addition to the time elapsed for processing the projects, a lack of easily accessible information regarding the progress in the development of project proposals, including the country-level endorsement of the project document, considerably limited the ability of the partners to identify and adequately address the bottlenecks.

156. In order to improve the efficiency of the enabling activity projects, it is essential to significantly reduce the length of the project design phase. The major milestones of the project design process should be made more transparent, mainly through a better sharing of information on the progress within the design cycle, so that the main partners involved can follow the process closely and intervene to break unnecessary deadlocks if needed. For example, a "project status sheet" could be

71 In general, budget revisions usually involved a small percentage of the overall project funding.

72 that the project coordinators were also apprehensive that negotiations for budget revisions would only delay project implementation.

established, and distributed to all the relevant staff within the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and the countries, highlighting the different steps of the processing cycle combined with regular updates on project status, as well as a project timeline and the names and contact information for the individuals responsible for each particular step. This would allow all the parties concerned to clearly identify the bottlenecks at each step and define good practice guidance allowing the acceleration of the process. While this additional transparency of the project cycle might require more resources, it is a critical issue, and the review recommends that the GEF explore adequate ways of providing any required additional resources.

TIME CONSTRAINTS

157. The review notes that, with few exceptions, most countries experienced difficulties in completing their enabling activity projects within the timeframe defined in the project documents. Realizing this, the Implementing Agencies have, in many cases, extended the project duration in response to requests from the country. It seems obvious that the expected duration was, from the beginning, unrealistic. Several factors explain the longer time horizon needed for the implementation of projects.

158. For a number of reasons, the early implementation period (from signing of the project document to first disbursement) was one of the most difficult to implement. First, policy and institutional processes related to climate change are relatively novel in most developing countries, where development concerns more immediately associated with poverty alleviation continue to be of greater priority. Second, it also requires a broad participatory approach, involving various stakeholders with different motivations and generally little experience in information exchange and inter-departmental consultation.

159. In addition, the preparatory work during this step consists in nominating or recruiting a project coordinator, selecting an appropriate team, building the relevant institutional arrangement for the project, identifying consultants as well as stakeholder representatives, organizing workshops, etc. This was quite difficult to carry out and demanded, in any case, several months to be fully achieved. Moreover, the project coordinators often found it difficult to familiarize themselves with the management rules of the Implementing Agencies and prepare budgets and work plans in accordance with these rules in a timely manner.

160. The need to proceed quickly with launching concrete project activities and a lack of local capacity forced the projects to resort extensively to consultants, usually from the national level. In some countries, however, the relevant specialized experts were often either non-existent at the national level or unavailable because of other commitments.

161. During the implementation stage there were several critical issues related to the availability and reliability of data as well as the technical complexity of the studies to be undertaken. There was also no systematic process for reviewing technical reports prepared by enabling activity projects. Though this affected the quality of the products, little remedial action could be undertaken given the budget and time constraints.

162. In many cases, the time needed to complete particular studies was underestimated, particularly for more technical and/or crosscutting aspects, such as baseline and scenario development and vulnerability assessment. Many countries placed an emphasis on building national capacity, even though it could result in significant project delays. Occasionally, however, and despite the budget limitations, a few projects resorted to international consultants in order to meet the schedule.

163. The review and validation of technical outputs, including the initial national communication, generally requires a broad consultation process among stakeholders. There is an inherent tradeoff, however, between the benefits of broad involvement and the time commitment such a consultation requires. Broad coordination and support, particularly on policy issues, was needed to bring the national communication together in a meaningful and consistent manner. Moreover, the political nature of the validation and approval of the national communication necessitated a much longer delay, with significant implications for the overall project duration. In that respect, the enabling activity expectations in terms of project duration were unrealistic, since they completely ignored the consultation and validation processes.

164. It is clear that such problems are not likely to occur in the future, since the enabling activity process is now well-understood by the countries, Implementing Agencies and GEF Secretariat. However, it is recommended that future enabling activity efforts include systematic pre-project consultation and awareness raising processes targeting the policy and decision-making levels prior to proceeding with the project proposals. In that respect, GEF focal points could benefit from GEF support for organizing workshops aimed at pre-project consultation. Such workshops could be presented by an appropriate expert or representative from the Implementing Agencies.

FUNDING CONSTRAINTS

165. The issue of funding was already raised earlier in this chapter. Globally, the review finds that the level of funding support has been sufficient for the preparation of the national communication, and of the basic documents. However, objectives linked to the sustainability of capacity building and of institutional arrangements, as well as to the integration of climate change concerns into national development policies, were unrealistic given the timeframe and the funding levels.

166. Considering the major weaknesses encountered in the enabling activity projects, the COP placed an emphasis on additional funding support needed by non-Annex I Parties in order to maintain and enhance relevant national capacities for the preparation of the initial and second national communications (2/CP.4). As a response to this COP4 guidance, the GEF decided to extend the operational guidelines to allow eligible countries to further address priority concerns with GEF assistance through the provision of funding support up to US$100,000 for complementary activities.[73]

167. Once again, the guidelines related to this "top-up" funding are not sufficiently clear, and this might lead to major misinterpretation by non-Annex I Parties, as well as by the Implementing Agencies. Despite the fact that information regarding the top-up funding was disseminated to countries via the COP, internet, and various NCSP publications and workshops, a number of countries during this review were unaware of this new support opportunity, or did not understand the conditions under which it is supposed to operate.[74]

168. Another question is related to the financial commitment of the countries themselves in carrying out enabling activity projects. The enabling activity projects aimed at the

---

73 *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Climate Change Enabling Activities. Part II:* Expedited Financing for (Interim) Measures for Capacity Building in Priority Areas.

74 Refer to the section entitled "GEF Response to Guidance from the COP" in Chapter II for additional analysis.

preparation of national communications are supposed to be financed by the GEF for the full agreed cost incurred by the non-Annex I Parties, exempting countries from any funding commitment. However, a number of countries had officially included in their project documents a provision for in-kind contributions such as office equipment and supplies, telephone, staff time, etc., which were therefore excluded from GEF support. While this is obviously an important sign of the commitment of these countries to contribute to the success of the enabling activity project, the effectiveness of these commitments has been questionable for several reasons:

- The in-kind contributions were rarely described in detail, which neither encouraged their realization during the implementation of the project nor allowed the country coordinators to officially demand this support from their respective governments;
- in some cases, the government did not have the resources to meet its commitments; and/or
- the interest of the government in the project was limited.

169. This review notes that in some cases, insufficient contributions from governments[75] when compared to their original commitments, have critically affected project implementation. It is recommended that when the country commits itself on a voluntary basis to a contribution in funding or in-kind, that this contribution be itemized in the same way as other funding sources such as the GEF so that it is considered as a serious commitment during project implementation.

ROLES OF THE PARTNERS IN THE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECT CYCLE

170. The countries, Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat have all played essential roles in the creation and evolution of the climate change enabling activity portfolio. In most cases, project preparation began with the GEF national focal point initiating contact with one of the Implementing Agencies. In some cases, however, direct contacts between country representatives and the regional bureaus of UNDP or a UNEP representative were established during major international meetings or other similar forums.

171. Regarding the interactions between the Implementing Agencies, the review finds that this relationship was based more on unfair or negative competition rather than on collaboration, particularly in the initial development of the enabling activity portfolio. The review came across some particularly egregious examples of lack of consultation among the Implementing Agencies[76] While the GEF structure encourages competition, the review notes that the guidelines were not applied consistently among the Implementing Agencies. Furthermore, the competition that did occur was based mainly on the level of

75 Including, but not limited to, inappropriate offices for the project, lack of a specific phone line for internet use, lack of office supplies or furniture such as computers and photocopiers, the non-affectation of permanent staff for the project, etc.

76 For instance, despite the implementation of the regional project in Caribbean countries (CPACC) by the World Bank through the OAS, UNDP has recently obtained GEF approval for 11 individual enabling activity national projects for the Caribbean. In this case, the consultations between UNDP and the World Bank were very limited. Moreover, the projects were developed using a "cookie-cutter" approach, and did not benefit from the experience gained by the CPACC project.

funding and on the flexibility of the application of the activity matrix and cost norms rather than on technical matters.

172. Initially, for example, the GEF Secretariat and UNDP expressed concern about the ability of UNEP to manage a full-fledged enabling activity program. These concerns were based on the absence of UNEP country offices and limited human resources available to oversee these projects. During this review, UNEP disputed these concerns and maintained that it does have the capacity to monitor these types of projects, given its long standing involvement in climate change activities and its network of national focal points, in addition to making better use of telecommunication, field visits and regional offices.

173. The issue of unfair competition between the Implementing Agencies may arise again, as soon as decisions are made concerning the direction of future support for enabling activities. Therefore, the review recommends that the roles and collaborative practices of the Implementing Agencies in climate change enabling activity projects be better defined in the future. The GEF Secretariat can contribute to strengthening the collaborative spirit and helping ensure consistent application of the guidelines across the agencies. Moreover, the GEF can contribute to stimulating synergies between the projects by maintaining a transparent and accessible information system, and keeping track of all enabling activity projects from the beginning of the design process.

GEF SECRETARIAT

174. The GEF Secretariat has two major roles in the enabling activity process. First, it has a leading role in responding to COP guidance through the development of guidelines. Second, it intervenes in reviewing the project proposals and recommending them for CEO approval.

175. While led by the GEF Secretariat, the process of responding to COP guidance also involved the three Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat. However, as stated earlier in the report, the Implementing Agencies and the UNFCCC Secretariat felt that their perspectives were not sufficiently taken into account by the GEF Secretariat when finalizing the guidelines.

176. Overall, the GEF response to COP guidance is considered pragmatic and timely, given that (i) the general wording of the COP decisions tended to leave room for divergent interpretations; and (ii) there was pressure to provide financial resources to countries to start preparing enabling activities. However, the review finds that the interpretation and operationalization of the COP guidance, in which the GEF Secretariat had a strong role, could have been more flexible, particularly in the application of the cost benchmarks and the activity matrix.

177. The GEF Secretariat was also fully involved in the development of the enabling activity portfolio. Once the request for an enabling activity project was received, the Implementing Agencies were responsible for providing technical assistance for the development of project proposals, following the GEF *Operational Guidelines*, and to transmit the project proposal to the GEF Secretariat. The GEF Secretariat was then responsible for verifying that the project met the enabling activity criteria and objectives and, if so, approving the project with the signature of the CEO. Generally, the intervention of the GEF Secretariat at this stage was short, meeting COP requirements to expedite the project approval process, though some rigidity in applying the cost benchmarks and the activity matrix was noted. It should be acknowledged that the quick reaction of the GEF Secretariat was facilitated by efforts made by the Implementing Agencies to faithfully adhere to the requirements of the GEF Secretariat.

Informal consultations were also initiated by the Implementing Agencies with the GEF Secretariat prior to formal submission of project proposals, in order to clarify specific issues and to address any potential difficulties.

178. On the other hand, the review noted that the GEF Secretariat, following its institutional mandate, kept some distance from project implementation, and did not pay close attention to follow-up actions. A closer association with the enabling activity process could help the GEF Secretariat respond quickly to needs evolving in countries, such as broader capacity development and investments in climate change.

UNDP

179. As of May 2000, UNDP had implemented 97 enabling activity projects, 91 of which are national projects (77 expedited projects and 14 non-expedited projects), and six of which are regional/global projects. The average enabling activity project budget in UNDP amounts to US$244,000 for expedited and US$647,000 for non-expedited projects. Since December 1996, UNDP has only developed expedited projects, the timing and scope of which were thought to be more appropriate for the preparation of the initial national communications. With few exceptions, it seems that the recipient countries were seldom informed that it was still possible to obtain funding for enabling activity project beyond US$350,000 limit imposed by expedited procedures.

180. To begin the project preparation process, countries usually transmitted a formal request for an enabling activity project to the UNDP country office, which would forward the request to the relevant UNDP regional bureau in New York, where it would be followed up by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinator. Despite some improvement over time, the review notes that processing time of enabling activity projects, that are to supposed to be expedited in UNDP is still too long. While a substantial reduction in time has been achieved in upstream project processing, little or no progress has been made in reducing project processing time in UNDP following approval by the GEF CEO.

181. Early on in the development of the enabling activity project portfolio (1996-1997), the increasing number of project proposals and demands on the UNDP New York staff made it difficult for the agency to provide the level of direct technical assistance that was needed by the countries.

182. Overall, the needs of the recipient countries for technical and managerial support were higher than originally anticipated in the early phase of the program. According to the Implementing Agencies, the GEF guidelines did not give room for more substantial support to the countries and this prevented them from allocating the level of human resources that would have better met the country needs. Given these resource constraints, UNDP viewed its role as mainly consisting of management oversight, with any possible technical contribution provided on an ad-hoc basis.

183. To overcome these resource constraints, UNDP turned to international consultants for the preparation of project briefs and, in some cases, for the formulation of project proposals. In other cases, UNDP staff undertook country visits for the same purpose and provided technical backstopping during implementation.[77] It is worth noting that because the enabling activity initiative was a novel experience, it necessitated a learning period. This resulted in varying quality in the design and content of

77 During project implementation, UNDP believed that the technical assistance role should be left to experts hired by the projects. In this case the UNDP contribution consisted of conducting a search for suitable candidates, preparing TORs and supervising the consultant's work to ensure smooth project implementation.

projects, due to different interpretations made of the GEF guidelines and/or unequal responsiveness to the countries' needs and priorities.

184. The human resource constraints of UNDP New York became more apparent during project implementation.[78] This was especially true when the projects began launching more technical studies. Participation by UNDP regional coordinators in technical seminars organized by the national projects occurred only occasionally. Moreover, UNDP's regional coordinators were not systematically able to assist in the Tripartite Reviews (TPR), despite the fact that the TPRs provide an important opportunity to discuss problems encountered by the projects and to define appropriate remedial actions (though technical issues are rarely addressed in such meetings). Hence, as soon as the projects were under implementation, UNDP turned to a more managerial role, with technical assistance generally provided by consultants recruited under individual projects.[79] Some technical backstopping, on an ad-hoc basis, however, was provided by UNDP's regional bureaus.

185. While the UNDP country offices also had a limited technical contribution at the outset, they were critical in ensuring general management oversight, including administrative support, serving as a liaison with UNDP New York, and facilitating the development and implementation of the projects. Later, the UNDP country offices strengthened their ability to address global environment issues and provide technical support to the countries by recruiting environmental specialists and creating the position of Sustainable Development Adviser.[80] In summary, this review notes that UNDP country offices have a much large role to play during project implementation and therefore recommends that UNDP keep exploring ways and means to provide country offices with greater technical expertise.

186. It is important to note that the launching of the National Communications Support Programme (NCSP) in 1998 has allowed UNDP to provide more effective technical assistance to the countries, and to contribute to capacity building through strengthening of information exchanges and the interactions between projects. In addition, this project allowed UNDP to have better knowledge of the achievements and progress of its enabling activity projects. More detailed information about this program will be provided in the *Technical Support* section of this chapter.

187. In order to enhance its ability to support enabling activity projects and to provide continuous backstopping technical assistance to its projects, UNDP decided to hire regional consultants. In practice, this was adopted only for West Africa. While the experience is mixed, with some countries in the region still complaining of inadequate technical support, this review recommends that UNDP widen the practice of hiring competent regional experts,

---

78 To a large extent, the NCSP has made a critical contribution towards filling this gap. Prior to the establishment of the NCSP, many countries had been unable to find appropriate support to address specific technical issues. Some of the most frequently mentioned difficulties were identification of appropriate approaches and experts to address vulnerability/adaptation assessments, and identification and use of existing GHG abatement models, in particular for the forestry and agriculture sectors.

79 It should be noted that the funding resources of the national enabling activity projects did not allow for a significant contribution from international experts.

80 The review noted that where strong and very qualified support was provided by the UNDP country offices, the enabling activity projects were generally very successful.

or support regional centers of excellence to assist countries in addressing the technical issues associated with the implementation of enabling activity projects.

188. All but four projects in the UNDP portfolio were executed by national agencies, creating room for strong country ownership of project results. Four of the projects were executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). The review team observed that the appointment of UNOPS as an executing agency has been problematic in most cases,[81] due to the rigidity of administrative and disbursement procedures applied. This generally resulted in delays during project implementation and de-motivation of UNDP country offices as well as the country representatives. It should be noted, however, that UNOPS was generally contracted in crisis countries or where UNDP did not have a country office.

189. For global/regional projects, with just one exception,[82] UNDP operated through different executing agencies[83] This approach allowed UNDP to be discharged of the daily management of these projects. Despite this approach, UNDP New York played a substantial role as an IA. In fact, it provided direct technical, as well as managerial, inputs to the projects. For instance, the ALGAS project was closely monitored and backstopped, and the Regional Coordinator attended all meetings. In addition, there were frequent exchange of information between UNDP Manila (Philippines) and the Asian Development Bank,[84] which is the Executing Agency of the project, through monthly meetings and exchange of status reports, forwarded by UNDP Manila to UNDP New York for comments.

190. UNDP also played a critical role in the design and implementation of the PICCAP project, through evaluation, review and provision of linkages to its other regional and global initiatives. In addition, the oversight provided by UNDP has also helped to ensure transparent and accountable project management. Unfortunately, a number of changes in UNDP accounting procedures over the project cycle and a series of staff changes at UNDP Apia (Samoa) may have affected the smoothness of the project implementation.

191. While UNDP played an appropriate role in implementing regional/global projects, the review is concerned about the country-ownership of these types of projects. UNDP needs to explore new executing arrangements to improve country ownership in regional or multi-country projects.

192. This review finds that implementation supervision at UNDP has room for improvement. Refer to the section *Assessment of Reporting and Management Procedures* included in the present chapter for details on this issue.

---

81 Delays in disbursements were also encountered by regional projects executed by UNOPS.

82 The exception is in the case of the Maghreb project, where one of the participating countries, Morocco, executed the project.

83 For instance, the Sub-Saharan Africa project (UNOPS), ALGAS (Asian Development Bank), PICCAP (UNOPS), CC:TRAIN I and II (UNITAR), etc.

84 ADB headquarters are located in Manila.

UNEP

193. As of May 2000, UNEP had implemented 25 climate change enabling activity projects, of which 22 are national enabling activity expedited projects, and three are regional/global projects. The average financing of a climate change enabling activity national project for UNEP amounts to US$274,000. Most of the projects (19 of 25) were launched in 1997-1998. As with UNDP, in most cases UNEP did not inform countries very clearly of the option of obtaining GEF support through non-expedited procedures.

194. Countries interested in collaborating with UNEP must first send an official letter of request to UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. UNEP then proceeds with project formulation, in consultation with the GEF and UNFCC focal point in the country. In general, these consultations were done by telephone, fax or email. In some cases, the UNEP task manager would undertake a country visit. The review notes that, while shortened from 1996 to 1997, the initial stages of project processing at UNEP are still too long. In addition, with the exception of the national GEF and UNFCCC focal points, only a limited number of stakeholders were involved in the project formulation stage as a result of this expedited process.

195. In most cases, the formulation of project proposals was made by using project documents from other countries, changing only the substantive elements outlining the special circumstances and needs of the countries. Once the project proposal was agreed upon by both parties, it was transmitted to the GEF Secretariat for approval. According to UNEP, countries have generally been satisfied with the modalities for formulating project documents.

196. The modalities of UNEP intervention are based on direct contact with the national executing agencies, and on the responsibility of the project coordinators for administrative and technical management. This has allowed the elimination of intermediate steps. According to UNEP, the countries are satisfied with the practical modalities of the project implementation, since: (i) They have direct access to the task manager at UNEP when needed, and (ii) they generally receive a quick and effective response from UNEP on any issue that is raised. However, the review found little evidence to support the latter statement at least in the countries that were a part of the review. Furthermore, the review notes that staff resources allocated by the UNEP for the development and implementation of enabling activity projects are not commensurate with the countries expectations and needs.

197. UNEP has made a substantial effort in maintaining a monitoring and data tracking system for its enabling activity projects, confirming that it wants to assume its technical assistance role in addition to the usual managerial role. Moreover, it was noted that in some cases, UNEP has been able to provide technical comments and suggestions on the documents produced by the projects, when countries requested this assistance.

198. Despite this tracking system, appropriate and timely actions to correct the course of projects, particularly those with institutional problems at the national level, are not always taken. In general, UNEP decided not to interfere in resolving what it considered to be internal institutional issues of the countries concerned. For instance, among the five UNEP-managed projects visited under this review, three suffered from delays caused by in-country institutional difficulties affecting implementation. Moreover, while financial reports are generally adequate, required information on project progress is not always provided and utilized in a timely manner.

199. The review finds that implementation supervision needs to be significantly strengthened in UNEP. Refer to the section *Assessment of Reporting and Management Procedures* included in the present chapter for details on this issue.

The World Bank

200. The World Bank's role in climate change enabling activity program has been limited. As of May 2000, its portfolio comprised three projects: two national projects and one regional project.[85] Though small in number the World Bank portfolio amounted to US$8.6 million, about 12% of the total grant funding approved by GEF for climate change enabling activity projects.

201. Bank staff interviewed for this review, including those involved with the program when it was launched, have provided useful insights about the factors that could have possibly influenced the Bank's decision to limit its involvement in the climate change enabling activity program. It should be recalled that the Bank also had limited participation in the biodiversity enabling activity projects, accounting for only 11% of the total funds allocated by the GEF to this effort.[86]

202. The first factor for this relatively weak involvement was the allocation of GEF related tasks among the Implementing Agencies. Though not formally articulated, it was assumed that this would be based on the comparative advantage of each agency. As capacity building, training and outreach were an integral part of the climate change enabling activity projects, there was a prima facie case for UNDP and UNEP to take lead on these, except in countries where the Bank had an active energy portfolio. The Bank, however, also appears to have been informally advised by the other members of the GEF family, including the UNFCCC Secretariat, to limit its involvement in the climate change enabling activity program to allow for a balanced development of the GEF portfolio among the Implementing Agencies.

203. The second factor relates to the perception of the Bank staff about the climate change enabling activity projects themselves. These projects were considered to be limited in scope, covering specifically the preparation of GHG inventories and associated capacity building, training and outreach activities. Engaging governments on a narrowly focused issue, some staff felt, would detract from the Bank's ongoing dialogue on energy policy reform and sector restructuring. As a result, Bank staff were hesitant about being actively involved in the climate change enabling activity program.

204. The third factor is cost effectiveness. World Bank staff felt that they would not have been able to comply with the Bank's internal policies and procedures within the budgets allocated for the climate change enabling activity projects, particularly in view of their focus on capacity building, training and outreach activities. Such activities, by their very nature, are resource intensive.

205. In retrospect, perceptions about the scope and cost-effectiveness of climate change enabling activity projects, may well have been a consequence of the Bank curtailing outreach activities for staff once it had been advised, albeit informally, to limit its involvement in the program.

---

85 The two national projects were St. Vincent and the Grenadines (approved under expedited procedures) and China (approved under non-expedited procedures), and the regional project was CPACC.

86 In terms of the total number of projects (17), however, World Bank participation in the biodiversity enabling activity projects was significant.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER CLIMATE CHANGE WORK

Effectiveness of regional/global GEF enabling activity projects and interactions with national enabling activity projects

206. In addition to the national enabling activity projects, 10 regional/global enabling activity projects were initiated by the GEF.[87] These projects were meant to address activities aimed at enhancing country capacities in achieving convention objectives in groups of countries where a regional or global approach was viewed as more efficient and cost-effective than a strictly national effort. The projects were intended to complement national enabling activity projects, with a primary focus on: (i) building capacities relevant to climate change and, in particular, to the preparation of national communications; (ii) enhancing information exchange; (iii) establishing and maintaining networks; and (iv) building public awareness.

207. In addition, several regional or global GEF projects also included technical studies which were of direct relevance to the national communication, such as GHG inventories (UNEP Country Case Studies on GHG Inventories, sub-Saharan Africa, PICCAP, etc.), vulnerability and impact assessment (UNEP Country Case Studies on Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation Assessments, CPACC, PICCAP, etc.), and GHG abatement (e.g. ALGAS).

208. In addition to the PICCAP and CPACC case studies prepared during the course of this review, the review team also examined the mid-term and/or final evaluations for most of the other regional/global projects. Overall, these projects have achieved satisfactory results, in particular in relation to the four main focus areas identified above. Though they started almost from scratch, these projects established, in a cost-effective way, a solid base of knowledge in the various fields of climate change, encouraged an exchange of information and experiences among countries, and mobilized active networks and expertise from developing countries while increasing the role played by developing country representatives at the regional and international level.

209. In some cases, the regional/global projects significantly involved and strengthened regional centers of excellence in developing countries, particularly in Africa. For instance, the sub-Saharan Africa project hired the international NGO ENDA (Senegal) to provide technical assistance to the four countries involved in the project. CC:TRAIN I worked with two NGOs, ENDA and the Southern Center (Zimbabwe), in the preparation of the CC:TRAIN training modules. Later, CC:TRAIN II also benefited from strong participation of experts from developing countries as trainers, including three regional partners from the developing countries.[88]

210. At the technical level, the regional and global projects have also made important contributions to the development of methodologies (e.g. UNEP Country Case Studies on GHG Inventories, UNEP Country Case Studies on Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation Assessments), as well as to the preparation of technical reports directly related to the national communication (ALGAS).

---

87 Refer to the complete list of projects in Annex 3.

88 Enda-TM, Fundacion Futuro Latinoamericano (FFPLA) and SPREP.

211. The regional/global projects have also laid the foundation for the national enabling activity projects and facilitated their design and implementation. For instance, the review finds that the preparation of project proposals was much smoother in countries having previous experience with a regional/global GEF project. In those cases, the UNDP country offices and national GEF focal points, as well as the primary stakeholders, were generally quite familiar with the enabling activity process. In addition, a reliable core of national experts had already been established.

212. Despite these undeniable contributions, the regional/global projects also had some major weaknesses, which limited the country-drivenness of these projects. In general, the global projects did not involve the recipient countries in the decision making process during project design and implementation, and the management approach of the regional projects lacked broad participation and information sharing, particularly in those projects implemented by external agencies.

213. The countries also felt that the regional/global projects put too much emphasis on meeting international commitments or regional concerns, at the expense of national priorities and of concrete national actions. In some cases the regional/global projects relied heavily on international consultants, with a significant portion of the project funding allocated to international companies or individuals. When national experts were utilized, there was often limited consultation with the countries in the selection of these consultants. This generated some frustration in the participating countries, which felt that after having achieved a sufficient level of knowledge and created a core of competent experts in climate change issues, much more emphasis could be laid on individual country needs and on the use of the national expertise.[89] In addition, it was obvious that the management modalities of the regional/global projects would not allow them to react easily to changing needs and circumstances. Specifically, a shift in resource allocation towards individual countries would have been difficult at best.

214. All these factors affected the ownership of the regional/global projects by the participating countries. For example, although the quality of the studies undertaken by the regional/global projects was generally rated very satisfactory, the countries often did not endorse the results, particularly in cases where the studies were undertaken away from official government institutions by academic experts.

215. It is worth noting that countries generally benefited greatly from their participation in regional/global projects in terms of capacity building, exchange of information and experience, public awareness, improvements in their negotiating capacities in international meetings, and their ability to access funding mechanisms. Nevertheless, the countries still felt that they were penalized by their participation in regional/global projects. In fact, when applying the activity matrix for national enabling activity projects, they experienced a dramatic drop in the budget allocation for their national enabling activity project as soon as it was made clear that they had previously participated in a regional/global project. While this may seem logical and equitable from one point of view, the countries often felt that, in the end, they had few tangible benefits to show from having participated in the regional/global project, given the weaknesses mentioned above and the funding implications. This situation has led to countries having a certain aversion against regional/global projects, despite their positive results and their irreplaceable role in enhancing country capacities, developing opportunities for information sharing, and boosting public awareness.

89 Contractual arrangements were usually defined before project implementation, making it difficult to introduce any change that aimed at responding to evolving circumstances.

216. In practice, there is an inherent risk of harmful competition between national enabling activity projects and regional/global projects. In order to strengthen the synergies and the complementarity between these two types of projects, the review finds it necessary to better differentiate the roles and the objectives of each of them. For example, the regional/global projects could focus on information exchange and network support, capacity building and training, development of methodologies, etc. The national projects, in turn, could focus on the preparation of national documents relevant to the UNFCCC.

Interactions with enabling activity projects supported by other external sources

217. In general, the perception of the countries regarding their participation in other enabling activity projects (e.g. USCSP, GTZ, et al), is similar to their perception of the GEF regional/global projects. While the technical contribution of these projects was generally satisfactory, factors like centralized managing modalities, an emphasis on global objectives over national interests, and a reliance on external expertise did not result in strong ownership of the final results by the participating countries. Moreover, the countries questioned the results of these efforts even more after realizing that they were being "penalized" when they proceeded with their national enabling activity project proposals to the GEF.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT

218. Non-Annex I parties have had an important need for assistance and technical support related to climate change.[90] In addition to the technical assistance required during the launching of different studies, the countries also had a need for peer review of the technical reports prior to validating them.

219. Technical support needs could be achieved through five different mechanisms:

- The use of consultants (national and/or international);
- Exchange of information and knowledge;
- Published or electronic references (manuals, guidelines, other relevant materials, software, models, etc.);
- Participation in training workshops; and
- Utilization of NCSP services.

220. **Consultants**. In general, an important share of the climate change enabling activity project budgets were allocated for the use of consultants. From the beginning, countries felt that enabling activities offered a unique opportunity to build national expertise on climate change issues. Therefore, they made extensive use of national consultants in the enabling activity process.

221. In cases where national capacities to develop climate change related studies were too limited, countries sometimes expressed their need for international expertise. However, the budget limitations of the national enabling activity projects often prevented countries from hiring international experts or allowed them to resort to this expertise to only a small extent.

222. In those cases where expertise and consulting capacity in the field of climate change was already established,[91] countries resorted to experts from academia or affiliated

90 Reasons for this include the complexity of the subject, uncertainties associated with scientific and technical knowledge, methodological difficulties, etc.

91 For instance, in countries that participated in previous climate change projects.

structures (universities, research centers), the NGOs, or even from government ministries. The participation of these experts is, of course, an asset for the projects, since in addition to their relatively inexpensive costs, members of academia and NGOs represent the main source of expertise in developing countries, while the representatives of ministries can often facilitate the development of enabling activity studies.

223. Nevertheless, the use of these national experts also caused some difficulties for the projects for several reasons. First, the participation of national consultants was difficult to secure, since they often had other on-going professional activities. Second, the participation of representatives from ministries as consultants, has, in some cases, caused conflicts of interest and confusion between their contribution as consultants, on one hand, and their role as representatives of their institutions, on the other. Finally, the relevant expertise in these countries was usually limited to a select group of individuals, with little transfer of knowledge or experience to the actual institutions in charge of climate change issues. These difficulties are expected to be reduced in the future, given the increasing market potential for the "climate change business" in developing countries, which should result in greater development of private-based consultancies.

224. In order to maintain existing capacities and to enlarge the groups of experts working on climate change issues, the review recommends that additional resources be made available for enhancing the capacity building component of enabling activity projects. This could be done by providing the enabling activity projects with the opportunity to focus on enhancing exchanges of information and experience, as well as broadening technical training to different groups of participants, including representatives from ministries, NGOs, academia, etc.[92]

225. With respect to international experts, and with few exceptions, the limited resources of the expedited projects did not allow countries to resort significantly to international consultants. In most cases, only global/regional projects (e.g. NCSP-Riso, Country Case Studies on Vulnerability-CICERO, sub-Saharan Africa-ENDA, CC :TRAIN-ENDA/ Southern Centre, ALGAS-AED, etc.) and some non-expedited projects were able to include a substantial international technical assistance component.

226. Where involved, international experts usually participated in the initiation or training workshops. The contribution of international consultants was important in providing technical backstopping support,[93] as well as sharing and transferring experience and knowledge to the national project staff. Globally, recipient countries expressed a high level of satisfaction regarding the contribution of international experts. A few countries indicated that they would liked to have had additional resources to hire international experts in a number of selective areas such as abatement, cost assessments, and vulnerability and adaptation, or for peer-reviewing of the final technical documents.

227. In light of this finding, the review recommends that the national enabling activity projects should have access to additional

92 For instance, through thematic workshops where country representatives would have to present the results of the technical studies, the obstacles encountered and the remedial actions adopted.

93 E.g., peer-reviewing the technical documents produced by the projects, advising for the programs and the content of training workshops, identifying consultants for some specific tasks, etc.

resources allowing countries to resort to international expertise when appropriate. In addition, this budget line should be managed flexibly in such a way that the countries can make budget reallocations to other activities, if the need for international experts does not occur during project development. Particular attention should be paid to resorting to regional experts and to supporting, for that purpose, regional centers of excellence.

228. The possibility of exchanging information and experiences via the internet or during workshops, for instance, was also perceived by the countries as one of the most valuable means for accessing technical support that the enabling activity project could have offered. However, because of budget and time constraints, expedited climate change enabling activity projects did not include these kind of activities. In fact, only the regional and global projects provided opportunities for exchanging information and experiences. In those cases, the positive effects for the countries were undeniable. The review mission considers it is essential that the national enabling activity projects contribute to enhancing the exchange of information and networking activities, with a clear description of these activities in the project document and an adequate budget allocation.

229. On a positive note, countries generally had easy **access to published resources** that were available around the world on the different aspects of climate change to be addressed in the initial national communication (manuals, guidelines, other relevant materials). Nevertheless, some resources were much more difficult to obtain (vulnerability assessments, climate modeling scenarios, GHG abatement assessments, GHG emission models and projections, etc.). Here also, the countries needed advice regarding the most appropriate resources to obtain and some indication of how to obtain them.

230. For project initiation workshops, or for training on different climate change related issues, many countries used the CC:TRAIN workshop package. Reactions to the material varied: some countries reported the package to be useful, while others felt the material was out of date, did not fit into the various country circumstances, and provided only general knowledge.[94] Much more precise and evolving technical training tools were needed by the countries to adequately enhance their capacities to undertake the different technical studies required under their enabling activity projects.

231. Many countries reported frustration at the lack of materials and software for carrying out technical studies, in particular those related to projections and modeling. In some cases, the cost of relevant software is prohibitive (e.g. MARKAL),[95] and the enabling activity projects did not provide sufficient resources for acquiring this software and the training necessary to utilize it. In other cases, countries could not even obtain sufficient indications of the existence of specific software,[96] or information on how to acquire necessary software and the training to use it. In addition, when materials were available, they were not always translated into national languages. All

94 Evidently, more focused training seminars are still necessary with the CC: TRAIN package. For example, the training in future emissions modeling is not sufficient for countries to launch mitigation studies.

95 MARKAL is an economy-energy-environment optimization model frequently used in the development of mitigation exercises.

96 This was a particular problem for countries undertaking mitigation assessments in the forestry and agriculture sectors.

these constraints have limited the quality and the rigor of some of the studies undertaken by the projects.

232. In light of these challenges, the review recommends that the GEF and the Implementing Agencies explore the various possibilities and mechanisms through which countries could better access essential software, as well to the corresponding documentation and necessary training to use it.

233. Countries participating in climate change enabling activity projects generally appreciated the technical support provided to the projects through the use of workshops and seminars. This support was often in the form of training workshops organized in the countries, or involved the participation of country representatives in various international training workshops or thematic technical seminars[97]. In terms of **international workshops** however, the countries felt that the national climate change enabling activities do not offer sufficient opportunities and resources to benefit from them. In countries where some flexibility on budget allocations was allowed, participation in several relevant workshops contributed considerably to capacity and awareness building, as well as to better involvement in international networks, and participation in the development of common methodologies and approaches.

234. In order to strengthen the capacity building and information exchange component of the projects, it is recommended that the national enabling activity projects provide adequate resources allowing the participation of country representatives in international seminars and workshops, with a particular emphasis on regional meetings.

235. Finally, the **NCSP** came out as one of the major initiatives to assist non-Annex I parties in meeting their reporting commitments (national communication) to the UNFCCC in a timely and comprehensive manner. UNDP took the lead in developing the proposal for this project. The NCSP is jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP, with a technical contribution from the UNEP Collaborating Centre on Energy and Environment (UCCEE-Riso-Denmark). These three organizations formed the Project Implementation Group, with the responsibility of coordinating operation and technical decisions of this project. In addition, a Project Steering Committee, consisting of two co-chairs (UNFCCC Secretariat and the GEF Secretariat), as well as UNDP, UNEP, and UCCEE, was put in charge of project monitoring and evaluation. The donors (the governments of Denmark, Finland, Norway and the European Commission) and the World Bank were invited to join the Steering Committee.

236. The NCSP was launched after consultations between the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP and the UNFCCC Secretariat. The aim of these consultations was to meet the additional technical assistance needs of the countries and to identify the most appropriate remedial actions to the obstacles addressed by non-Annex I parties during the implementation of the enabling activity climate change projects, such as:

- Weak awareness among policy makers of the reporting obligations to the UNFCCC;
- Limited national expertise and inadequate information on existing regional and international expertise; and
- Lack of information on training opportunities.

97 Particularly, those focusing on the presentation of results of various studies and national and international experiences.

237. The project began in January 1999 and should conclude by December 2000. The NCSP received US$3.2 million of funding, of which US$1.8 million was provided by GEF (including a PDF-B allocation), US$0.8 million was provided by the European Commission, and US$0.4 million from Denmark and Norway. The activities of the project were defined on the basis of the findings of a survey undertaken during a workshop involving African and Latin American representatives. The project included three main components:

(a) A help guide;

(b) Technical assistance; and

(c) Regional exchange and thematic workshops.

238. Items (a) and (c) were to be managed by UNDP, with the collaboration and assistance of UNEP. The regional workshops for Africa, for instance, were to be organized by UNEP. Initially, item (b) was supposed to be managed by UNEP, with the relevant tasks to be sub-contracted to the UCCEE. However, the TORs for technical assistance (TA) in the agreed workplan state that UNDP manages the TA and that the UCCEE responds to the requests from the UNDP support unit. UNEP also had some information dissemination activities and the responsibility of providing UNDP with an updated status of its enabling activity portfolio.

239. The thematic regional workshops planned by the NCSP were meant to offer countries the opportunity to exchange their respective experiences and to present the results of the different studies undertaken by the national enabling activity projects. In response to the needs expressed by the countries, the NCSP also organized a few training sessions.

240. Overall, during the past years, the participating countries widely recognized the positive results of the NCSP as having at least partly offset the gaps of national enabling activity projects in terms of technical assistance. While having achieved satisfactory results, it is unfortunate that the NCSP arrived somewhat late in the enabling activity process[98] with most projects having been well underway, and some of the initial hurdles for which the assistance of the NCSP could have been the most relevant already over to a certain extent. For instance, the "Help Guide" was supposed to be useful primarily during the initiation workshops of the climate change enabling activity projects. Nonetheless, the help guide has been disseminated to UNDP project coordinators. The Caribbean region, in particular, has reported the guide to be beneficial. The guide is also part of a "starter package" of resources that is now sent to any enabling activity once it is in the pipeline.[99] It is also accessible through the NCSP website.

241. The NCSP has also improved the monitoring system of GEF enabling activity projects by establishing a database comprising an updated version of the status of the preparation of the national communication and other relevant documents. The inputs to this database are provided through a data collection system based on bi-annual surveys targeting all non-Annex I Parties that are preparing their national communications under their national enabling activity climate change projects. The data collection is also based on workshop consultations and regular telephone calls.

---

98 Program execution only started in 1999 while the national enabling activity projects started in 1995.

99 The help guide also contains information routinely requested by many project coordinators, such as draft Terms of References for consultants.

242. It is important to recall that each of the two Implementing Agencies involved in the NCSP, with its different strengths and assets, has an important role to play in the achievement of the project's objectives. In that respect, the review found that the collaboration between the UNDP and UNEP was not perfect, and that there is considerable room for improving the quality of the support provided to enabling activity projects through closer coordination of the activities of the project between the two agencies. The Project Steering Committee might play a leading role in establishing the appropriate collaborative spirits and enhancing the interactions between the two agencies.

243. It should also be noted that the NCSP is close to completion while the country needs for technical assistance and support, information exchange, networking, etc., are still increasing and evolving. Moreover, the NCSP has accumulated very valuable information and experience related to the crucial issues associated with the enabling activity projects, and with the preparation of the national communication. All this "capital" will be lost unless the project continues. While it is the role of the independent evaluation of the NCSP to provide a comprehensive assessment of the NCSP's performance, this review would support its continuation, given its critical contribution to the enabling activity program as a whole.

Country Level Implementation Issues

❒ *Stakeholder Participation*

244. In assessing stakeholder participation at the national level, the review placed emphasis on the following issues:

- Institutional arrangements;
- Participation of representatives from various government agencies;
- Participation of other stakeholders such as members of academia, NGOs, private sector and other groups.

245. The pressure to prepare proposals rapidly and the generally weak tradition of broad institutional participation in many developing countries often limited participation by national stakeholders. This lack of consultation at the beginning of the process led not only to insufficient consideration of country concerns, but also to an inadequate evaluation of the resources necessary for the different activities necessary to prepare the national communication. While it is undeniable that a broad participatory approach could slow the project preparation phase, it is equally true that participation of different stakeholders during preparation minimizes the risk of institutional resistance or non-cooperation during implementation.

246. In contrast, during project implementation, the review finds that the level of stakeholder participation and cooperation was much higher than during the project formulation stage.

247. The first priority of the enabling activity projects was to establish appropriate institutional arrangements for project implementation. In countries that already had a National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), this did not represent a major problem, since most stakeholders were already known and identified and could be counted on to oversee the implementation of the enabling activity project. In countries where national level institutions such as an NCCC did not exist, however, the establishment of project steering committees presented some problems.

248. Some countries reported that major obstacles for the enabling activity projects were related to establishing effective co-ordination among the different ministries involved and raising awareness among policymakers. In general, those countries that included senior-level policymakers from a range of ministries

on their NCCC tended to report fewer institutional problems than those countries in which the NCCC was comprised of scientific or technical personnel only. However, the NCCC is not a panacea. Several projects were based on an optimistic assumption that the existence of the NCCC would facilitate the establishment of project committees. While this worked for some countries,[100] in general, NCCCs were neither active, nor operational, and were not granted the necessary legal and institutional legitimacy to effectively play their role.

249. There is a clear weakness in the process of appointing representatives to project committees. In most cases, representatives appointed because of their technical competencies did not have a decision-making role within their respective institutions, or were not required to report back to their institutions. As a result, the project steering committees often functioned in an isolated manner, and were unable to internalize the possible feedback within their native institutions.

250. In some cases, the appointment of the lead agency also led to disagreements between national institutions that often handicapped the projects, before and during implementation. Weak stakeholder involvement during project preparation contributed to increasing the risks related to such institutional disagreements. In general, disagreements about the leadership of projects often led to long negotiations within the countries, resulting in significant delays in signing the project documents.

251. Several cases of delays or suspensions of projects occurred because of institutional instability or a change in project leadership. This highlighted an excessive dependency of projects on the specific institutional arrangements made by the countries. Projects could manage such risks by including in the project documents alternative institutional arrangements, in consultation with the Implementing Agencies, if needed. These project documents should include terms of reference of all the permanent and non-permanent staff of the project and clearly describe the background and experience required.

252. The review also notes the weaknesses of project documents regarding institutional strengthening. Although most projects included institutional strengthening as an objective, neither adequate resources—due to funding limitations—nor appropriate activities for achieving these goals were actually programmed.[101] As a result, institutional strengthening remains one of the major gaps of enabling activity projects, and in most cases, enabling activity projects did not succeed in creating the appropriate conditions for the sustainability of the institutional arrangements. Most of the time, additional financial resources to support institutional strengthening was still needed even in countries where the main objectives related to the preparation of the national communication were met in a very satisfactory manner.

253. On the part of the countries, there has seldom been any commitment to maintain staff working on climate change issues. In countries where such staff have been maintained, the climate change enabling activity process has been sustainable. It is important to stress that any effort by the GEF and Implementing Agencies will only be successful in the presence of strong commitments from the host countries.

---

100 This was the case, for instance, in the Philippines.

101 As illustration, only a single workshop was scheduled for institutional strengthening in Mali, which is obviously unrealistic.

254. A number of major recommendations can be made in order to strengthen the institutional arrangements that deal with climate change in general and to improve the effectiveness of enabling activity projects:

- Secure strong *involvement* (not simply an endorsement) at the highest ministerial and political level for enabling activities;
- Emphasize public-awareness activities in enabling activity projects, directed towards decision and policy makers, and provide adequate resources for them;
- Encourage the establishment of climate change departments or centers to ensure the continuity of climate change studies, as well as follow-up actions; and
- Encourage the establishment or the enhancement of NCCCs by providing them with official recognition and entrusting them with broad climate change-related responsibilities, including international negotiations and decision-making on investment opportunities.

255. The process of appointing a project coordinator often delayed project implementation. This was often due to disagreements between and within institutions regarding the most appropriate candidate. In some cases, fortunately, the extra time taken was due to the fact that the authorities wished to select the best possible candidate. Despite the resulting delays, these precautions often paid off, since the personality of the project coordinator was often a critical factor for project success.[102]

256. This indecisiveness regarding appointment of the project coordinator was more acute in cases where the coordinator's position was financed by the project. Most often the appointment process was not sufficiently transparent. To safeguard the interest of projects, such decisions should be based on an open recruitment for candidates and involve the Implementing Agencies.

257. The contribution of project committees in the technical work was primarily done through participation in training workshops, reviews of documents prepared by consultants and strategic discussions related to the UNFCCC. While it was a "good practice" that national consultants were involved in these workshops, it was noted that in most cases, the participants from government were usually not motivated to practice the methodologies for which they had been trained and often lost the benefits of that training over time. It is, therefore, essential, that in order to have the capacity to review and endorse the outputs and to be able to launch concrete follow-up actions, government representatives ensure a minimum level of active participation and monitoring of these studies.

258. After the institutional arrangements were established, more technical activities were undertaken by the projects during the second stage of implementation. These included: (i) the organization of training workshops; (ii) the evaluation of studies carried out as part of previous projects to identify the complementary activities to be carried out by the enabling activity project; and (iii) the execution of studies. The review found that these activities were generally properly sequenced, and represent a substantial effort made by the countries to build on the results of the existing initiatives.

259. The experience with participation by civil society varied considerably. For instance, the involvement of experts from universities and

102 This was particularly the case in Lebanon. However, two other important factors also led to such notable success: the dynamism of the UNDP country office representatives and the high motivation and competence of the national consultants.

academic institutions was, in most cases, essential for project progress. In return, these experts were able to strengthen and broaden their skills and receive new collaborating opportunities through participation in international events and connection to existing networks. In the future, it is important that enabling activity projects put greater emphasis on involvement by these types of civil society experts.

260. In the regional/global enabling activity projects, NGOs often played a critical role in the steering committees, as well as in participating in the various activities of the projects. Regarding the national enabling activity projects, NGO involvement was mostly effective, however the review noted also a number of instances of weak or partial participation of the NGOs. In the latter cases this weak involvement of NGOs was due to weak consideration to the NGOs in the project documents, or to a rather restrictive perception of governmental institutions regarding participation of NGOs in the enabling activity project.

261. To date, enabling activity projects have focused primarily on the international obligations of countries rather than on concrete actions. Nevertheless, NGOs could provide positive contributions for a number of important issues, such as vulnerability and adaptation measures. In countries that rely heavily on woodfuel, for example, the contribution of NGOs in developing abatement measures, while at the same time targeting social and economic welfare, is critical, considering their experience and field involvement in woodfuel use and resource management.

262. Finally, the participation of NGOs could also be particularly important for strategic issues related to the preparation of the national communication. Several NGOs in developing countries have considerable experience and understanding of climate change issues. This is due to their successive participation in the COP and other forums, as well as their numerous interactions with international NGOs and agencies focussing on climate change. It is obvious that the enabling activity climate change projects would have certainly benefited from greater involvement of NGOs on such issues.

263. With few exceptions, the participation of community-based groups was very limited. There, early and active involvement in the climate change process, in particular through enabling activity projects, would be an asset. In the Philippines, for instance, thematic workshops targeted to the provinces and dedicated to discussions on climate change issues and impacts were very much appreciated.

264. Participation of the private sector, with the exception of consulting firms, was weak and most often nonexistent. Even when some projects mentioned the participation of the private sector in their projects, it was essentially to note that this sector represented difficulties for providing information during the execution of some studies. While it should be recognized that the private sector in developing countries often operates under strong economic constraints and limited human resources and time, enabling activity projects should better engage this sector. For instance, in some countries, such as Bolivia and Zambia, a growing awareness and interest of industry in climate change issues was noted, and this resulted in a direct and positive dialogue between the government and private sector representatives.

265. Participation by the private sector is particularly important for the development of concrete actions such as abatement or adaptation projects. All sectors (industry, agriculture, forestry, etc.) that could benefit from the establishment of new financial mechanisms for developing abatement options should be involved.

❑ ***INTEGRATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE CONCERNS AND RESULTS INTO PLANNING ACTIVITIES***

266. In most cases, due to a limited emphasis and support for awareness raising activities and information exchange among and within the governmental agencies, enabling activity projects did not adequately meet the original expectations regarding integration of climate change concerns into national development policies. In the future, projects should pay more attention to this crucial issue, through a clear description of activities that are meant to support this objective and provision of adequate resources.

ASSESSMENT OF REPORTING AND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

267. Since UNDP and UNEP have the major shares of the portfolio, the assessment of reporting and management procedures is restricted to these two implementing Agencies.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

268. In the case of UNDP, the supervision of the implementation of enabling activity projects is delegated to the UNDP country offices. As a result, the major monitoring mechanism for UNDP is the Annual Programme/Project Report (APR), elaborated by the project coordinator and submitted to the UNDP office in the country in preparation for the annual Tripartite Review—a high policy-level meeting[10] to assess progress based on theAPR and make management recommendations if necessary.

269. Generally, the APR contains two sections: Part I, a numerical rating on a set of project attributes, and Part II, Textual Assessment. Nevertheless, this review finds that as they are presently formulated, the APR and TPR reports cannot be considered relevant tools for technical oversight and supervision of the projects. In fact, the information provided in the APR is not substantive enough. Moreover, the APR is not provided on a regular basis to staff and regional coordinators at UNDP-GEF; its use is also uneven across the regional bureaus. This poses a crucial problem, as most UNDP staff in country offices are not well versed in environmental issues, and problems are not brought to the attention of UNDP-GEF until they become critical.

270. This review recommends that APRs be made available on a regular basis to the regional coordinators at UNDP-GEF to provide them with an oversight and pulse for implementation progress of the projects.

United Nations Environment Programmes (UNEP)

271. Since UNEP does not have any country offices, implementation supervision is centralized at the UNEP headquarters in Nairobi with the support of its regional offices. The major supervision mechanism for UNEP is continuous interaction with the national project coordinators through telephone, e-mail, fax and occasional field visits. In addition, quarterly progress reports are submitted by the project coordinator. However, this review finds that quarterly progress reports are not substantive and usually consist of a list of activities carried out during the preceding quarter. Clear identification of problems in project implementation is not carried out in the quarterly reports, though there is a section in the report titled "summary of problems encountered in project delivery."

10) Involving the project executing agency, the government counterpart, and the UNDP representative.

272. While the project manager is often aware of problems in project implementation, given his span of control (22 projects), in addition to his other responsibilities, the manager is not able to respond to problems adequately as they develop during implementation. Furthermore, there are no systematic supervision visits. As a result, the review finds that critical implementation problems have developed in several UNEP implemented projects.

273. This review recommends that UNEP strengthen the use of the quarterly report for supervision purposes and develop a regular system of visits to countries where project implementation is not progressing satisfactorily in order to take corrective action.

Overall Management

274. Currently there is no systematic process in place to obtain a GEF-wide understanding of the implementation progress and results of enabling activities. These are not covered under the annual GEF-wide Project Implementation Review (PIR). The most consistent and accessible information regarding the progress of the enabling activities has been largely due to the National Communications Support Program (NCSP). The review recognizes, however, that the NCSP data (a) are unofficial, (b) collected for the program only, (c) originates directly from the project managers, and d) will not continue to be collected beyond the limited lifetime of the program.

275. This review recommends that the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies establish an annual stock-taking review of enabling activities, and obtain an institution-wide understanding of the performance of these projects.

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TECHNICAL PRODUCTS

276. The climate change enabling activity projects in general included the following products: (i) GHG inventory; (ii) vulnerability and adaptation assessments; (iii) abatement assessments; and (iv) national communication.

277. The review observes that the enabling activity projects produced an impressive quantity of documents that directly related to the communication commitments under the Convention. Moreover, a large number of other documents, such as ones on methodology, manuals or studies about more specific aspects, were also produced. As of May 2000, 25 countries that benefited from GEF-supported enabling activities have transmitted their national communications to the UNFCCC Secretariat, and a large number of countries are progressing towards the completion of their communications for possible transmission by COP6.[104]

278. The review notes that, for the most part, the quality of the documents produced under the enabling activity projects was satisfactory. This demonstrates a significant enhancement of skills in the fields of inventories, mitigation, and vulnerability and adaptation, while at the same time providing substantial inputs to the national communication. In some cases, the quality of the documents was impressive, and provided not only national, but international benefits as well. However, the impression is that they have not been disseminated widely enough, either within the countries or at regional or international levels. An appropriate mechanism, with adequate resource allocation, could be established by the GEF in order to enhance interactions between projects and promote the dissemination of these technical products. This will help improve exchange of information and experiences, an important Convention objective.

279. Technical work was not without difficulties in some cases. Among the various factors identified as affecting the quality of the documents are:[105]

(a) Uncertainties associated with the quality of the basic data, or difficulties in obtaining them. It is worth noting that enabling activity projects did not provide resources for primary data collection;

(b) Methodologies not yet finalized or not relevant to some national circumstances;

(c) The contribution of training was insufficient or faded out. This might be due to the poor quality of tools used for training, the nomination of inappropriate persons for training, or a lack of commitment to maintaining staff stability in recipient countries and host governments.

---

104 In addition, as stated earlier, Kazakhstan also submitted its initial communication without implementing any GEF-supported enabling activity project.

105 The NCSP provided a very valuable synthesis and analysis of most of the points that are addressed in these sections. Inputs to these analyses were extracted from the frequent surveys that are undertaken by the NCSP, in particular during the regional workshops that are organized by this project. In addition, the review benefited from the information collected through the country visits and country studies, as well as the surveys that were distributed, to which 62 countries responded.

(d) Lack of capacity (due to factors a, b and c above) in some countries to prepare higher quality products; or insufficient motivation, with work being looked upon as obligatory, with little emphasis on national benefits;

(e) Absence of internal and external peer review of documents produced;

(f) Various problems and obstacles, often institutional, encountered during the progress of the projects.

280. Most countries believe that reducing the uncertainty of **national inventories** is a critical issue for future studies and the second communication, and stress the need to improve activity data and emission factors. Towards this objective, many countries have expressed interest in participating in regional projects aimed at improving emission factors and activity data, and establishing an effective process for sharing experiences with other regions.

281. Many countries have suggested enhancement of data reliability through more systematic data collection efforts. Resource and time constraints, as well as weak institutional motivation, were the most critical barriers in undertaking these efforts during the implementation of enabling activity projects.[106] In addition, the countries generally required methodologies for managing and updating data, including software, and guidance on how to establish national systems. Most countries see the creation of a national database as essential to maintaining capacity and ensuring the continuity of the preparation of the national communications. In that respect, a well established institutional framework, with appropriate regulatory tools and incentives, are among the most critical factors for sustaining the process that had been launched so far by climate change enabling activity projects.

282. Reducing uncertainties, in particular through improvement in the quality of data, provision of appropriate models for emission projections, along with training in their application, were also reported by the countries as essential for further improvement in **abatement analyses** Other key difficulties are related to construction of appropriate baseline scenarios and development of abatement cost assessments—there is a demand here for good cost-assessment models.

OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

283. The development of projects for GHG abatement options is an obvious follow-up of the abatement analysis exercise. However, countries have few indications from the GEF regarding the follow-up actions that can be taken after completing the national communication "exercise," and are unsure of the extent to which the existing financial mechanisms will be able to provide financial assistance for the priorities mentioned in their initial communications.

284. In addition, because the GEF Guidelines do not allow for developing project proposals, the enabling activity projects did not explicitly address concrete investment activities, despite UNDP's arguments[107] in favor of developing abatement and adaptation project proposals as

106 The climate change enabling activities did not make a provision for such activities.

107 According to UNDP, this was one of the major points of disagreement during the formulation of the guidelines. The UNDP position was that to be meaningful, enabling activities should be allowed to proceed from sector-wide projections of abatement potential to the initial stages of project formulation. The GEF Secretariat disagreed, arguing that the enabling activity projects should not extend beyond studies directly related to the national communication.

a part of the enabling activity projects. The GEF has not made yet significant steps towards clarifying this issue, though many countries expressed greater expectations about this question to the SBI.[108] This is not to deny that there have been some good examples of investment actions emerging from enabling activities—ALGAS project outputs have been well received by donor agencies as well as the Implementing Agencies and the private sector; the PICCAP and the enabling activity projects in Lebanon, Philippines, and Thailand are other good examples. In this context, it is recommended that the GEF and its Implementing Agencies establish a closer dialogue process with the countries in order to identify their expectations and prepare the appropriate framework for responding to them.

285. For many countries, funding and time constraints have limited the scope of the national **vulnerability and adaptation studies**[109] and constrained them from conducting additional studies that were identified as of critical importance." Integrated assessments, socio-economic studies, identification of adaptation options (phase I and II) and costing implications are frequently reported as priority areas for future work.

286. This issue was compounded by the fact that most climate change scenario development, at national levels, is undertaken using Global Climate Models that provide a relatively low level of spatial resolution for national impact studies. Some countries support the development of Regional Climate Models (RCMs), but many others believe there is insufficient national data and/or expertise to develop them. It is important to reduce uncertainties related to vulnerability assessments, and the impacts of climate change, in order to improve the quality of remedial strategies.

287. Other common issues include unreliable or unavailable data, lack of long-term capacity building in appropriate institutions, and insufficient infrastructure such as monitoring stations for systematic observation and early warning systems. Provision of resources for developing climate modeling for improving data and involving experts from developing countries are among the most important priorities expressed by countries.

288. It is likely that the establishment of a permanent framework for improving and updating the quality of data in the various areas of climate change, for the purpose of meeting the UNFCCC communication requirements, would be one of the most critical issues that will have to be addressed by non-Annex I parties in the future. The question is whether this should be addressed through the enabling activity projects or through a parallel process.

289. Capacity building was obviously one of the core objectives of the enabling activity process. While the countries expressed higher expectations for capacity building than what the enabling activity projects could offer, there was undeniable evidence in the countries that the enabling activity projects have made

---

108 Refer to document FCCC/SBI/1999/8, pp. 14, statement (c).

109 For instance, emphasis was generally laid on sea level rise, while important needs were expressed in relation with impacts assessments for forestry, agriculture, water resources, food security, etc. In addition, Phase I-Adaptation assessments were rarely carried out, while Phase II-Adaptation was not addressed at all.

considerable progress in strengthening the capacities of countries to deal with climate change issues. There is also evidence that enabling activity projects have achieved indirect benefits. For instance, they have enhanced the participation of the non-Annex I parties in international fora, particularly the COP, and seems to have strengthened their presence and contribution in the decision making process.

290. The enabling activity projects have also contributed considerably towards enhancing the scientific and technical knowledge in recipient countries, and to developing new methodologies.[111] There is evidence that universities and academic institutions have significantly benefited from enabling activity projects, through participation in training and technical studies. In some cases, universities have even included specific courses on climate change, and involved students in their research on climate change.

291. Cross-sectoral analysis has also helped establish a new collaborative spirit among stakeholders involved in the process. This should help improve interactions and consultations between national institutions, even beyond the simple climate change process.

292. Moreover, in some cases, work related to climate change activities was used as a foundation for confirming or re-aligning development policies. The development of energy conservation strategies, the promotion of renewable energy, and the adoption of better forestry management practices figured in the list of the development priorities.

293. Despite these results, many countries have expressed concerns about the sustainability of the process that was launched by the enabling activity projects—once the projects close, countries are not sure how to keep the teams in place for the preparation of the subsequent national communications. These concerns have already been noted by the Parties to the Convention, and decisions 2/CP.4 and 12/CP.4 brought a response requiring the GEF to support an ad-hoc "bridging" mechanism. As a response to this request, the GEF Council approved additional funding to further supporting climate change enabling activity projects, and issued *Operational Guidelines for Expedited Procedures-Part II* for enabling activity projects.

294. These guidelines were meant to respond to the capacity building needs of the countries beyond preparing initial national communication. Countries eligible for GEF assistance may select from the five following activities according to their needs and priorities:

- Identification/submission of technology needs, including the necessary capacity building to assess, acquire, design, implement and evaluate projects;
- Capacity building for participation in systematic observation networks;
- Improvement of emission factors;
- Maintenance and enhancement of national capacities to prepare national communications;
- Developing/strengthening/improving national activities for public awareness and education, and access to information.

295. It is clear that these are the main weaknesses encountered by the climate change enabling activity projects. While the financing

111 GHG inventories, costing assessments, vulnerability assessments, etc.

granted through top-up funding will certainly contribute to keeping the climate change process "alive," it represents only an interim solution until a more long term mechanism is defined. In addition, a longer term mechanism should also incorporate actions for improving national institutional arrangements and mechanisms to ensure integration of climate change issues into the regular planning process in recipient countries.

296. Several countries had the option to develop websites, although only a few projects made provisions for this purpose. Most of the sites designed include little information, and are not maintained or enhanced. In most cases, the sites have been suspended at the end of the project. It is the opinion of the review that websites represent a cost-effective and efficient tool for meeting the convention requirements. The review recommends that enabling activity projects give better support to such initiatives in the future, by granting the necessary resources for (i) the development of websites; (ii) the enhancement of sites by including all climate change-related information (inventories, vulnerability, adaptation, attenuation, research, observation, project portfolio, etc.); and (iii) the regular updating of information contained in these sites.

VII. GOOD PRACTICES

297. The review team identified a number of good practices that were adopted by the countries or the Implementing Agencies in order to improve the results and efficiency of the enabling activity projects and their effectiveness. Good practices were also adopted to overcome some obstacles by giving more flexibility to the implementation of enabling activity projects. These good practices are described in the following paragraphs, for illustrative purposes, on the basis of the specific experiences of the countries visited or studied during the review. Despite varying and changing country circumstances, it is useful for countries to take stock of these experiences, and to try to adapt these good practices to their specific needs in the future.

ACHIEVING ADDITIONAL BENEFITS THAT SERVE REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONCERNS

298. The enabling activity project in Brazil is achieving impressive results that go beyond providing benefits only for the country, since Brazil has about one-third of all tropical forests. In fact, in addition to strengthening national capacity by developing more specific deforestation data, the enabling activity project is achieving a significant reduction of the uncertainty in calculating the emissions from tropical deforestation. It is likely that this methodology will provide significant contributions to the work of the IPCC and benefit many other countries.

299. Brazil has also established a solid base for monitoring land-use change and forestry through satellite imagery. The review found this GEF initiative very relevant as it serves the climate change process as a whole, and is likely to promote the replicability and dissemination of this experience in other countries.

300. In Armenia, the enabling activity project highlighted the impact of climate change on forestry resources, and has also developed simulation models showing these impacts.

ACHIEVING OUTREACH AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE BENEFITS THROUGH THE USE OF INTERNET

301. The Brazil climate change enabling activity project was also one of the first countries to have developed a climate change website in 1995. This innovative and interesting idea has contributed significantly to the development of the Brazilian National Communication and to raising public awareness. This constituted an important tool for the implementation of the Brazilian commitments under the UNFCCC. The importance of this idea has been recognized by the UNFCCC Secretariat, which has created the CC:INFOWEB program for the diffusion of the Brazilian model to other developing countries.

302. Reflecting the whole preparation process of the national communication, the site makes available all the information generated by the institutions and experts involved in the preparation of inventories and documents for the national communication, including the name and contact information of all the experts involved and responsible for the elaboration of each document. This enhances the quality and reliability of the work, ensuring transparency and allowing a greater participation of experts

not involved directly in the process but who wish to make comments and suggestions.

303. The internet has also made possible a forum for interaction and experience sharing among experts from different sectors, facilitating the collective development of the work, shortening distances, and decreasing costs and the need for meetings and trips. Thus the climate change internet site has strengthened the capacity of the coordination unit and helped to decentralize the preparation of the national communication, allowing a complete involvement of all relevant institutions, regardless of their geographical location.

304. As the website has been developed in three languages—Portuguese, Spanish and English—the Brazilian climate change site is rapidly becoming a reference site internationally and is enhancing Brazil's participation in the global climate change debate.

305. Although access to the internet in Brazil is still limited, network conditions are evolving rapidly, resulting in an exponential increase of the number of Brazilian internet users. In the long run, the effect of the extensive use of the internet in Brazil for climate change matters may be very significant, in particular for general awareness raising, dissemination of knowledge, and a better integration of the climate change concerns into the daily activities of Brazilians.

306. Some other countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Honduras, Lebanon, Philippines, etc.) had made similar attempts to establish websites with varying results and benefits. The main issue encountered related to maintenance of the website after the end of the enabling activity project. This required more human resources and relevant data resources to accomplish.

INVOLVING THE MEDIA IN THE PUBLIC-AWARENESS EFFORT

307. Enabling activity projects have rarely utilized the media for information dissemination and public awareness. The media can be a useful actor in translating technical and scientific statements that are provided by the experts into more easily accessible communication material for the general public. It is recommended that enabling activity projects place more emphasis on involving journalists in the different workshops and meetings held by the projects.

308. Some projects used the media for wider information dissemination, with very positive impacts. In the CPACC project, for example, a public awareness strategy has been developed, including a suite of public education and awareness materials, such as briefing documents for decision-makers, teaching kits and video scripts. Additionally, journalists have been sensitized to climate change issues, with encouraging results. For example, one journalist from Saint Lucia who participated in this workshop, held in Trinidad and Tobago, has since been making frequent references to climate change in his newspaper columns.

309. Zambia has also tried to target the media sector through the organization of a workshop for awareness building among representatives of the print and electronic media, with a view towards encouraging the media to disseminate information on climate change issues. The PICCAP project has often complemented its outreach and public awareness campaigns with items prepared for the written media, radio and television.

Developing interaction between projects

310. In some cases, the national enabling activity projects have developed relationships and synergies that allowed the countries to benefit from the exchange of information and experience. These also contributed to enhancing the technical capacities of the countries and to significantly reducing the level of uncertainty in the results.

311. In Azerbaijan, for instance, a regional workshop on greenhouse gas emissions was conducted in cooperation with the National Communications Support Program. Experts from several countries in the Central Asia Region participated in the workshop. The Azerbaijan team found the experience extremely valuable for cross-checking and validating their approach to the preparation of the inventory. Similar experiences have been also organized by the NCSP and proved very beneficial to the countries.

312. In West Africa, UNDP also initiated a similar regional workshop in Mali. The objective of this workshop was to allow participants from Benin and Chad, which were just at the beginning of the implementation of their enabling activity projects at that time, to benefit from the experience gained by Senegal and Mali, which were in a more advanced stage of developing their climate change studies and preparing their initial national communication.

313. PICAPP is also an outstanding example of regional cooperation. Through cooperative efforts with other institutions and programs, other countries (both within and outside the Pacific islands region) have been able to participate in, and hence benefit from, the capacity building activities of PICCAP. This has included participation in PICCAP's training workshops and the use of PICCAP's training and information resources. Countries that have benefited directly included the Maldives, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, and many Caribbean countries, particularly those participating in the CPACC project.

314. In addition to the benefits to countries in taking stock of experience gained by their regional neighbors, regional interaction is also a cost-effective way for strengthening capacities and improving the quality of the studies prepared by the countries. Therefore, the review recommends that this initiative be developed in a more systematic way by providing for additional resources in the enabling activity projects, regardless of whether they have a national or regional/global approach.

Participation in international training workshops and international events

315. As mentioned earlier, the enabling activity projects did not provide resources for travel and participation in international workshops and events. In Lesotho, for instance, the enabling activity project paid particular attention to capacity building through participation of different country experts in several relevant workshops and seminars outside Lesotho (seven in Africa and two outside Africa). These have considerably contributed to the success of the project, and to increasing the ability of Lesotho to meet the convention communication requirements.

316. Although such expenditures are normally not eligible under GEF enabling activities, the rationale for this practice is that these meetings provide country representatives with unique training opportunities and serve as important venues for updating their knowledge of climate change issues. In light of this result, the review recommends that this practice be more explicitly recognized and appropriately provisioned for in the future.

Enhancing political support from the highest levels of government

317. In many countries, the enabling activity projects have suffered considerably from weak political support to the activities implemented by the project. It is the opinion of the review that strong political support is a crucial condition not only for the success of the enabling activity projects but also for the development of the climate change process as a whole in the countries. This strong support may be evidenced through the involvement of high level decision-makers and official establishment of climate change committees.

318. In Azerbaijan, for instance, a State Commission on Climate Change was established by Presidential order. This Committee is chaired by the First Deputy Prime Minister and meets once every two months. To implement the climate change enabling activity project, the National Center for Climate Change was established with the coordination of the State Hydrometeorology Committee. The high-level political attention to the issue has galvanized all the relevant government ministries and agencies and led them to contribute their best efforts to the implementation of the Project.

319. The Philippines also established an Inter-Agency Committee for Climate Change (IACCC) by Presidential order, and has involved high level representatives from the most important ministries and stakeholders in this IACCC.

320. In Lesotho, climate change has also received support from the Minister of Natural Resources, and this greatly contributed to the success of the project.

Wider participation of the stakeholders

321. Stakeholder participation is undoubtedly an important factor for the success of enabling activity projects. The review observed that countries did not systematically stress the importance of such participation, particularly at the policymaking level. This resulted in an insufficient endorsement of the results and limited integration of climate change concerns into the planning activities, as put into question the sustainability of the climate change policy process as a whole.

322. In that respect, the review observed that the benefits of enabling activity projects were most effective in countries where emphasis was laid on widening stakeholder participation. In the Philippines, for instance, significant stakeholder participation has contributed to a satisfactory implementation of activities and a timely completion of the project. In Lesotho, an inter-agency team, which was in charge of the implementation of the project, involved highly skilled professionals from the relevant ministries, agencies, academic institutions and NGOs. In Zambia, the project has also promoted the participation of representatives from universities, NGOs, and most relevant government agencies at the national level. The Zambian Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry also advised the team that there is a growing awareness in industry on climate change issues, and that there is a need for direct dialogue with them. Thus, the private sector was fully involved in the activities of the project.

323. In Armenia, the composition of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and the role that it played in providing guidance and supervision to the project has contributed to the satisfactory implementation of the project. The PSC

comprises 16 members, including the Minister of Nature Protection (Chairman), five First Vice Ministers (Nature Protection, Energy, Economy, Agriculture and Industry) and representatives of international donor agencies, research institutions, academics and NGOs. The PSC, by its very composition and active participation in developing the Project's strategic agenda and in selection and appointment of the national consultants, underscore the importance of the project to the country.

FLEXIBILITY IN REALLOCATING PROJECT FUNDING

324. While the resource allocations for enabling activity projects globally have adequately covered the activities aimed at achieving the main goal of preparing the national communication, flexibility in funding allocations, during the implementation of the projects were very much appreciated by the countries. In Zambia, for instance, reallocation of resources among budget categories, especially the increased outlays for training, education and awareness has contributed to a better response to country needs, and thus to improving the benefits and the results of the project.

325. Activities that were better supported in Zambia include an awareness building workshop for key stakeholders such as government planning officers and the private sector to promote climate change concerns in the planning process. Another workshop was organized for awareness building among representatives of the media.

FLEXIBILITY IN REDESIGNING THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES

326. Effectively addressing climate change issues can be like shooting at a moving target because of the continuing evolution of information, needs and priorities. It is unfortunate that many projects have suffered from a lack of flexibility would help countries react to these changing circumstances. One good practice would be to allow for greater flexibility and a more pro-active approach from the Implementing Agencies and the project participants. This would contribute towards increasing effectiveness of projects in meeting evolving needs of countries.

327. Some projects were able to adopt this flexibility. For instance, the first Multipartite Project Review (MPR) of the PICAPP project suggested that identification of mitigation options be shifted from a national to a regional activity, on the grounds that such an approach was consistent with the lack of technical capacity at national level and that it would also be more cost effective. The Project committee supported this change, with agreement from all the Parties to endorse the regional report, with an adequate reference to national level implications. National level mitigation activities are now being captured in the National Implementation Strategies and through other initiatives such as the National Strategic Studies that facilitates national projects under the Clean Development Mechanism.

PICAPP Summary Box

Few projects better exhibit the spirit behind the creation of climate change enabling activities than the one undertaken by ten Pacific Island nations in a regional effort aimed at fulfilling their obligations under the UNFCCC.[1]

The Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP) is a three-year, $2.4 million GEF project implemented in June 1997 by UNDP and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The project had six major capacity building objectives that led to the following outputs:

- Greenhouse gas inventory (sources and sinks);
- An evaluation of mitigation options;
- National vulnerability assessments;
- An evaluation of adaptation options;
- National implementation plans; and
- Submission of the Initial National Communication to the COP.

While these goals and outputs are common to many other projects, PICCAP is remarkable in its overall level of achievement, particularly in light of the limited human, institutional, and financial resources available at the outset only three years ago.[2] Not only have all but one of the formal project objectives been met, within the prescribed time frames and reportedly within budget, but a sustainable system of national assessment and reporting is now in place in the ten countries. This latter achievement can be measured in the form of officially recognized institutional structures, trained nationals, and nascent information management procedures. Moreover, integrated national policies and plans related to climate change are in an advanced stage of development in most countries.

PICCAP employed a country team approach which involved the national government designating an agency to host a team of sectoral representatives, national experts, and other stakeholders, including private sector and NGO interests, who in turn facilitate policy and decision-making on climate change issues. At the national level, PICCAP has been implemented in three phases: (i) establishment of a country team and enhancement of awareness regarding climate change issues; (ii) analyses of climate change issues and completion of activities specified in Article 12 of the UNFCCC; and (iii) policy development and enhanced public participation.

Despite the initial limitations, PICCAP was implemented predominantly through the effort of national consultants or national government employees, without the use of international consultants. When regional consultants were used, they were required to work with national counterparts and transfer knowledge and expertise in ways that enhance human resources in a sustainable manner. Another innovative example in capacity building was the creation of a course leading to a Certificate in Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment, which is further helping the Pacific nations secure long-term, home grown expertise.

The enhancement of capacity has not been limited to the project participants. Through cooperative efforts with other institutions and programs, other countries in and out of the region have been able to participate in, and benefit from, the capacity building activities of PICCAP. This has included participation in PICCAP's training workshops and the use of PICCAP's training and information resources.

The success of PICCAP can be partially attributed to the inherent recognition by the participants that capacity building is integral to fulfilling their obligations under the UNFCCC. It also reflects the application of the collective experience and wisdom of its partner organizations. UNDP, for instance, played a critical role in project design, implementation, and evaluation, while SPREP facilitated working relationships between the countries and provided contributions in terms of technical, administrative, and financial support. Other participants, including CC:TRAIN, provided vital roles as well.

---

1 These ten nations are the Cook Islands, Republic of Fiji, Republic of Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Republic of Vanuatu.

2 The existence of these limitations, in fact, was seen as one of the primary justifications for pursuing a regional approach.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1
TERMS OF REFERENCE

BACKGROUND

1. **Enabling activities** Enabling activities —which include preparation of inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and design of strategies and action plans— represent a basic building block of GEF assistance to countries. They either are a means of fulfilling essential communications requirements to a Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country. Countries thus enabled will have the ability to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs to address global environmental problems through a cost effective approach within the context of national sustainable development efforts.[1]

2. **Climate Change Enabling Activities** In the context of climate change, enabling activities were defined by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as "[measures] such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures."

3. The first Conference of the Parties (COP1) to the FCCC, requested the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the entity operating the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC on an interim basis, to give priority to the support of national communications:

"Priority should be given to the funding of agreed full costs (or agreed full incremental costs, as appropriate) incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.F and other relevant commitments under the Convention. In the initial period, emphasis should be placed on enabling activities undertaken by developing country Parties, such as planning and endogenous capacity-building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate

---

1 GEF Operational Strategy, 1996, page 9

2 Article 12.1 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) requires that each Party, in accordance with Article 4.1, shall communicate to the Conference of the Parties, through the Convention Secretariat, the following elements of information:

"(a) A national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, to the extent its capacities permit, using comparable methodologies to be promoted and agreed upon by the Conference of the Parties;

(b) A general description of steps taken or envisaged by the Party to implement the Convention; and

(c) Any other information that the Party considers relevant to the achievement of the objective of the Convention and suitable for inclusion in its communication, including, if feasible, material relevant for calculations of global emission trends".

implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures."[3]

4. At its second meeting, the Conference of the Parties (COP2) adopted detailed guidelines[4] for the content of the first national communications from non-Annex-I Parties. In its guidance to the GEF, COP2 confirmed that these guidelines and format shall form the basis for the funding of communications from non-Annex I Parties. The guidance also required the GEF to expedite the approval and disbursement of financial resources for this purpose and consider country-specific needs and other approaches which may be used for several countries with similar needs, upon request, and take into account that the preparation of national communications is a continuing process.[5]

5. At the Fourth Conference of Parties (COP4), guidance to the GEF emphasized the need for funding support for preparing initial and subsequent national communications "by maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacity, so as to prepare the initial and second national communications which will take into account experiences, including gaps and problems identified in previous national communications, and guidelines established by the Conference of Parties."[6] COP4 also decided "to ensure that issues and concerns identified by non-Annex I Parties in their initial communications are brought to the attention of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and through it, as appropriate, its implementing agencies when undertaking the comprehensive review of enabling activities projects."[7]

6. **GEF Supported Enabling Activities**[8] Among the enabling activities, those that are specifically related to countries' obligations to first national communications under Article 12.1 of the UNFCCC are eligible for GEF financing on the basis of "agreed full costs." The GEF has prepared operational criteria, issued in Feb 1996 and revised in Feb 1997, to guide the preparation and scheduling of support for these activities, following expedited procedures.[9]

---

3 Decision 11/CP.1, item b(i) in document FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its First Session, held at Berlin from 28 March to 7 April, 1995, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its First Session.

4 Decision 10/CP.2, Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: guidelines, facilitation and process for consideration, in document FCCC/CP/1996/15/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Second Session, held at Geneva from 8 to 19 July 1996, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at is Second Session.

5 Decision 11/CP.2, paras 1(c) and (d), Guidance to the Global Environment Facility, in document FCCC/CP/1996/15/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Second Session, held at Geneva from 8 to 19 July 1996, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at is Second Session.

6 Decision 2/CP.4, para 1(d) Additional guidance to the operating entity of the financial mechanism, in document FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Fourth Session, held at Buenos Aires from 2 to 14 November 1998, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of Parties at its fourth session.

7 Decision 12/CP.4, para 1(d), Initial National Communications from Parties not included in Annex-I of the Convention in document FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, Report of the Conference of the Parties on its Fourth Session, held at Buenos Aires from 2 to 14 November 1998, Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of Parties at its fourth session.

8 GEF Operational Strategy, 1997, page 37

9 Operational Criteria for enabling activities: Climate Change, GEF/C.7/Inf.10, February 1996 Operational Criteria for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from non-Annex-I Parties, February 1997.

STATUS OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES

7. The GEF has supported Climate Change Enabling Activities in a total of 128 countries amounting to a total GEF allocation of US$72 million through:

- enabling activities processed through expedited procedures in 96 countries amounting to US$24 million;
- enabling activities supported as full projects in 14 countries[10] amounting to US$10 million;
- 10 global/regional projects in 18 countries[11] amounting to US$36 million; and

8. In March 1998, the GEF approved a National Communications Support Programme amounting to US$2 million, implemented jointly by the UNDP and UNEP. The project is geared towards enhancing the capacity of participating non-Annex I Parties to prepare their initial national communications to the UNFCCC. The activities of the project aim to improve the quality, comprehensiveness, and timeliness of the initial national communication from non-Annex I Parties to the Convention in accordance with the guidance provided by CoP-2 through the operation of a "Help" desk for climate change enabling activities, provision of additional technical assistance to countries preparing national communications and through the organization of a number of thematic and regional exchange workshops.

RATIONALE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

9. The Study of GEF's Overall Performance recommended a comprehensive review of enabling activities to "determine how successful the projects have been, analyze the reasons for those that have failed, and consider policy and programmatic responses to the problem".[12] The GEF Council, endorsed this recommendation at the October 1998 meeting.[13] Since a sizeable number of activities have been implemented (or are underway), it would be useful to understand the effectiveness of climate change enabling activities in participating countries. In addition, the outputs from this study are expected to provide useful inputs to the Capacity Building Initiative proposed under the Strategic Partnerships (GEF/C.13/9).

10. The overall purpose of the study will be to take stock of experience with GEF-supported climate change enabling activities and to extract lessons for future enabling activities. Specifically, the study is expected to examine: (i) the effectiveness of the enabling activity modality; (ii) the effectiveness and efficiency of the process—the GEF approval process and the national execution process; (iii) influence on broader capacity building and/or planning in countries through the process of preparation of initial communications; and (iv) best practices from country experiences.

---

10 Jordan received support both under full project and under expedited procedure.

11 Note that the global/regional projects also cover some of the countries listed in categories (a) and (b).

12 Study of GEF's Overall Performance, pp.57.

13 Decision on Agenda Item 8 *Action Plan on Follow-up to the Overall Performance Study*, Joint Summary of the Chairs, GEF Council Meeting, October 14-16, 1998.

11. The review will cover items (a), (b), and (c) listed in para 7. The National Communications Support Programme will be considered in the review to examine how the program is covering gaps identified in the GEF-supported enabling activities. The specific activities to be conducted under the study are:

Response to guidance from the COP

(a) Identify elements of COP guidance (from among those referenced in footnotes 3, 4, and 5) to which the GEF Operational Criteria on Climate Change Enabling Activities has responded.

(b) Assess the responsiveness of operationalization of elements of COP guidance relevant to GEF Climate Change Enabling Activities in terms of: (i) timeliness of response; and (ii) reflection of the content and spirit of the guidance.

(c) Describe the evolution of the consultation process between the GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, and the UNFCCC Secretariat in the operationalization of Convention guidance in terms of specific milestones of consultation.

Effectiveness of the operational criteria

(d) Assess the appropriateness of the GEF Operational Criteria for Climate Change Enabling Activities in terms of: (i) ease of interpretation and operationalization by the IAs and participating countries; (ii) its guidance on preparation of national communication; and (iii) applicability and flexibility to specific country needs.

(e) Evaluate the effects of expedited procedures in terms of elapsed times for different stages of the project preparation, approval, and disbursement process.

Portfolio overview

(f) Identify the status of various countries enabling activities, specifying the status of sub-components, and preparation/ submission of first national communications.

Project design and implementation

(g) Compare the activities of enabling activity projects against the GEF Operational Criteria for Climate Change Enabling Activities, and carry out a preliminary evaluation of adequacy of the GEF cost norms to facilitate the completion of each of the components of the enabling activities towards meeting the objective of preparing the first national communications.[14]

(h) Assess the roles played by the countries, the Implementing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat in developing the portfolio of enabling activities, and the impact of enabling activities on the GEF portfolio as a whole. Assess the GEFSEC-IA review/dialogue process and its consistency with established timelines, quality and relevance of technical comments; and the impacts on project design and implementation.

---

14 The comparison should be done in the context of evolution of procedures and norms of enabling activities, with reference to specific time periods when enabling activity projects were reviewed and approved.

(i) Assess the adequacy of budgets made available to the Implementing Agencies to design and implement enabling activities; assess the adequacy of project implementation time and schedule.

(j) Examine how the enabling activities complemented existing climate change related activities in country. Specifically examine the complementarity with enabling activities supported by other external sources of financing.

(k) Identify the sources, and assess the quality of technical assistance available to design and implement the projects, with specific reference to: (i) advice and inputs from Implementing Agencies; (ii) manuals, guidelines or other relevant materials; and (iii) consultants, with particular attention to the use of national and regional consultants.

(l) Assess the roles, level, and mode of participation of different stakeholders (governments, NGOs, private sector, academic/research institutions, etc) in project design and implementation.

(m) Assess the contribution (complementary and supplementary) of the regional and global climate change enabling activity projects on country-level enabling activity projects and/or national communications. Assess possible synergies or overlaps between GEF-supported activities and bilateral programs.

(n) Assess whether the National Communications Support Programme is providing adequate and appropriate additional assistance to countries to address identified gaps in the enabling activity project design.

(o) Assess the reporting and management procedures on implementation of enabling activities.

(p) Assess the relative merit and cost-effectiveness of capacity building through the three different approaches for enabling activities—full country projects, regional projects, projects under expedited procedures, as referenced in para. 7.

Project results

(q) In countries where implementation has been underway for a significant amount of time:

(i) assess, if possible, whether the contributions of enabling activities are progressing towards meeting objectives set forth in the project design, including preparation and submission of initial communications.

(ii) assess the early results and sustainability of capacity building activities—improvements to national institutional arrangements, training, data gathering and research, education, enhancement of human resources, and consideration in planning of response measures in accordance with the Convention, and other issues, such as capacity to improve and prepare inventories—included in the enabling activity projects.

(iii) assess additional benefits, if any, that have resulted from enabling activities.

Best practices

(r) Describe remedial actions taken by IAs to early problems identified with the design and implementation of enabling activities.

(s) Identify the best practices and lessons learned in the design and implementation

Recommendations

(t) Recommend broadly what modifications, if any, should be undertaken in the future to respond to future guidance from the COPs regarding national communications.

(u) Recommend possible improvements in design, budgeting, appraisal and approval procedures, stakeholder participation and other relevant elements of enabling activities.

METHODOLOGY

12. The proposed methodology for the study will cover the following broad areas:

(a) Review of relevant documentation at the GEF Secretariat, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, the World Bank, and the UNFCCC Secretariat.

(b) Visits to the Implementing Agencies and discussions with GEF regional coordinators and task managers of enabling activities.

(c) Consultation with relevant stakeholders such as the UNFCCC Secretariat, other relevant bilateral and multilateral agencies, international, regional and local NGOs, including academic institutions.

(d) Views expressed by the Parties through the Convention process;[15]

(e) Preparation of regional overviews (case studies) by consultants, focusing on regional groups of countries which may have undertaken a common approach to enabling activities.

(f) Preparation of country case studies on selected countries by local consultants.

(g) Country visits by study team members.

(h) Questionnaires to countries (to be carried out together with ongoing work under the National Communications Support Programme).

STUDY TEAM

13. The study will be carried out by a team comprising of members from the implementing agencies, the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, an international consultant, and local in-country consultants. The identified members of the study team are as follows:

- Mr. Samir Amous, team leader/ international consultant.
- Ms. Bo Lim, Mr. Richard Hosier, and other members of the UNDP-GEF climate change team (with Mr. Martin Krause) UNDP
- Mr. Ravi Sharma, UNEP
- Mr. Mahesh Sharma, World Bank
- Mr. Avani Vaish, GEF Secretariat
- Messrs. Jarle Harstad, Ramesh Ramankutty, GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Team.

---

15 FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.3, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention; Provision of Technical and Financial Support, FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, Preparation for Review of Enabling Activities, Views of Parties with regard to the review of the Global

- Local consultants (to be identified depending on countries for case studies and field visits

14. The team will participate in all stages of the study, including developing detailed plan and methodology for the study and participate in initial synthesis discussions on finding and conclusions following country visits. Local consultants will participate in the team visits to countries and preparation of selected country case studies.

15. The team leader (with inputs from the team) will prepare an Inception Report, which will contain an overview of the data sources, plans on how to address the various issues, outlines of questionnaires or structured interview guides, a list of countries proposed for case studies and country visits, as well as a schedule for the execution of the study.

Country selection criteria

16. The team members will visit a selected number of countries. The countries will be selected to broadly represent the following factors

(a) projects approved under expedited procedures/projects that were approved under normal GEF procedures;

(b) projects that are close to completion/ projects that are in early stages of implementation;

(c) Large/small projects.

(d) Large/small countries/island nations.

(e) Countries with low emissions and high vulnerability/countries with high emissions and low vulnerability.

(f) Geographical balance.

(g) Implementing Agency representation

OUTPUT

17. The team leader will be responsible for preparing the first draft of the report, based on country visit reports and on inputs provided by the team members.[14] Based on feedback received, a second draft will be prepared for management review at the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies. Following management review, a third draft will be prepared and forwarded to countries covered under visits and case studies for their comments. Based on feedback, the final report will be prepared for submission to the GEF Council. The final report will consist of 30-50 pages plus appendices, including, inter-alia, a list of all interviewees and data sources.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

1. Identification of independent consultant	January 4, 2000
2. Finalization of Terms of Reference for review	February 7, 2000
3. Team Meeting to go over TOR and finalize methodology	February 7, 2000
4. Finalization of countries for visits and case studies	February 7, 2000
5. Consultation with IAs, GEFSec, UNFCCC Secretariat and Desk Review	February 2000
6. Inception Report	February 25, 2000
7. Country Visits and Country Case Studies	March–April 2000
8. First Draft Report—to team for review	June 15, 2000
9. Second Draft Report—for GEFSEC-IA management review	July 15, 2000
10. Third Draft Report—for country comments	August 15, 2000
11. Final Report	September 31, 2000
12. Desktopping and Publishing	October 1, 2000

ANNEX 2

THE REVIEW APPROACH

The review was managed by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation team at the GEF Secretariat. It involved an inter-agency taskforce comprised of staff members from the UNDP, UNEP, The World Bank, and the GEF Secretariat, and led by Mr. Samir Amous, an international consultant.

The review collected information from a variety of sources, including desk review of project documents and other relevant documentation, consultations with the Implementing Agencies and UNFCCC Secretariat, views expressed by the Parties through the UNFCCC, country visits, country and regional case studies, and questionnaire surveys. In addition, the review will benefit from the large information framework developed by the National Communication Support Programme.

THE REVIEW AGENDA

The initial phase of the review started on February 2, 2000, with the first visit of the Team leader to the GEF Secretariat at Washington D.C. The aim of this first visit was to organize meetings with all concerned Parties including the Team members, and to finalize the implementing framework of the review :

- Finalization of the terms of reference of the review;
- Finalization of the reviewing approach;
- Finalization of the Guidelines for country visits/country studies;
- Selection of the countries to be included in the review;
- Finalization of the review schedule;
- Task assignments to Team members;
- Finalization of the questionnaires to be addressed to country coordinators for a broader review of enabling activity project;
- Identification of national/Regional consultants for country visits and country/ regional studies

FINALIZATION OF THE REVIEWING APPROACH

The information gathering started in March 2000 with the country visits, country studies and transmission of the questionnaires to the project coordinators. Country visits were completed in April 2000 except for Armenia, which was completed in May 2000.

THE REVIEW TEAM

The core review team comprised of following 10 experts:

- ✓ Samir Amous (team leader)
- ✓ Jarle Harstad (GEF-M&E team)
- ✓ Martin Krause (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Bo Lim (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Ramesh Ramankutty (GEF-M&E team)
- ✓ Ademola Salau (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Mahesh Sharma (The World Bank)
- ✓ Ravi Sharma (UNEP)
- ✓ Miguel Torralba, (UNDP-GEF)
- ✓ Avani Vaish (GEF Secretariat)

Country Visits	
Armenia	Ms. Aida Iskoyan
Azerbaijan	Mr. Imran Behbudov
Bolivia	Mr. Mauricio Meza Caestro
Brazil	Mr. Emilio La Rovere
Cameroon	Dr. J.H. Chendjou
Lebanon	Dr. Riad Chedid
Lesotho	Ms. Lucy Khalema Redeby
Mali	Dr. Arona Coulibaly
Philippines	Ms. Marisol Portal
South Africa	Mr. Khotsombi Matibe
Vietnam	Dr. Nguyen Duc Minh
Zambia	Mr. David Mbewe
Country Studies	
Egypt	Mohamed ElSobki, Associate Prof., Cairo University
Honduras	Mr. Jaime J. Bustillo Pon, independent consultant
India	Prof. P.R. Shukla, Prof. Indian Institute of Mgmt.
Malaysia	Dr. G. Sivalingam. Prof. University of Malaya
Regional Studies	
Caribbean	Mr. Cletus Springer, Impact Consultancy Services
Pacific	Prof. John Hays, Waikato University

In addition, regional and national consultants were hired to assist with country visits or to undertake country/regional studies. Team members, implementing agencies and their country offices, as well as the UNFCCC Secretariat assisted in the identification of consultants. The list of the consultants involved in the review is as listed above.

Documents consulted for the review

The review had also relied on the existing documentation available at GEF-SEC as well as at Implementing Agencies Headquarters, Regional Bureaus and country offices. The types of documents that were reviewed had included:

- any relevant technical document related to the Enabling Activity projects (e.g. National Communications, GHG Inventories, etc.);
- views expressed by the Parties through the UNFCCC;
- project evaluations (mid-evaluation, Final evaluation, Tripartite review, etc.);
- project status reports including PIMS (where relevant);
- Annual Project Report (APR);
- quarterly operational reports;
- project status reports;
- any document relevant for the review;
- UNDP and UNEP databases for EA projects.

Country visits and country/regional studies

Eighteen enabling activity projects were included in the review. Twelve of them were visited by the review core team, four others national projects have been concerned by country studies, and two regional projects were reviewed by regional consultants. In addition a special attention was be paid to National Communication Support Programme and

where applicable, a broad assessment of the potential enabling contribution/benefits of Global/Regional projects was made in the countries concerned by the review.

The team members visited a selected number of countries. The countries were selected according to the following parameters:

- projects approved under expedited procedures/projects that were approved under normal GEF procedures;
- projects that are close to completion/ projects that are in early stages of implementation;
- large/small projects;
- large/small countries/island nations;
- countries with low emissions and high vulnerability/countries with high emissions and low vulnerability;
- geographical balance;
- implementing agency representation.

The nineteen reviewed projects represent around 14% of the total number of GEF climate change enabling activity projects. The total budget of these projects amounts to US $15.7 million, which represents around 22% of the total budget allocated to climate change enabling activities. In addition, the good regional balance and IA

LIST OF COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW OF THE GEF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

	IA	Region	Procedure	Budget (US Dollars)
COUNTRY VISITS				
Mali	UNDP	SSA	EP	94,780
South Africa	UNEP	SSA	EP	321,000
Lesotho	UNEP	SSA	EP	350,000
Zambia	UNEP	SSA	EP	256,000
Cameroon	UNEP	SSA	EP	265,000
Vietnam	UNEP	EAP	EP	212,500
Armenia	UNDP	ECA	FP	350,000
Azerbaijan	UNDP	ECA	EP	324,500
Brazil	UNDP	LAC	FP	1,500,000
Bolivia	UNDP	LAC	EP	185,220
Lebanon	UNDP	MENA	EP	292,600
COUNTRY STUDIES				
India	UNDP	EAP	FP	1,500,000
Egypt	UNDP	MENA	FP	402,000
Honduras	UNDP	LAC	EP	325,000
Malaysia	UNDP	EAP	FP	470,000
REGIONAL CASE STUDIES				
PICAPP	UNDP	EAP	FP	2,440,000
CPACC	WB	LAC	FP	6,300,000
TOTAL				15,743,080

IA : Implementing Agency EP : Expedited Project FP : Full Projects
CPACC includes Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago)
PICAPP includes Pacific Islands : Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Samoa, Salomon

representativeness of the sampled projects will give a correct overview of the reality of the enabling activity portfolio as a whole.

In general, the country visits included two core team members and a national consultant. The national consultant was responsible for:

- preparing the contacts and schedule for the meetings with stakeholders;
- collecting all relevant information and documentation;
- making a first analysis of the enabling activity project on the basis of the terms of reference of the review;
- accompanying and assisting the country visit teams; and
- providing follow-up activities after country visit completion where needed.

Country studies included 4 countries. National consultants were commissioned to undertake these country studies and to provide a country report to the core team. Regional studies included 2 projects. Regional consultants were commissioned to undertake these regional studies and to provide reports to the core team. The regional review required the consultant to travel to a number of countries that were covered by the regional projects.

BROADER ASSESSMENT

Review survey

In addition to the 18 projects specifically concerned by the review, a survey was conducted in order to get broader inputs from enabling activity projects. A questionnaire was prepared for that purpose (ref. Annex 12), and transmitted to the project coordinators. The questionnaire included 5 main modules corresponding to the items in the terms of reference for the review:

- project details (project name, project coordinator, dates, telephone, email, etc.);
- project design-related questions;
- project implementation-related questions;
- . project results;
- overall project experience.

Information gathering through the National Communication Support Programme

Since its commencement, the National Communication Support Programme has made an important effort to gather and maintain information regarding the enabling activity projects. The review team had the opportunity to look to the files that are maintained by NCSP and incorporate that information into the review.

Interactions between national EA projects and regional/global projects

During the country visits and country/ Regional studies, the team members also sought information on the Global/Regional projects that directly concerned the country, and tried to assess the interaction between the national enabling activity projects and these Global/Regional projects.

ANNEX 3

LIST OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

Enabling Activities Supported Under Expedited Procedures

No.	Country	IA	Amount (US $)	Date of CEO Approval	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement (By Quarter for UNDP*)
1	Albania	UNDP	$278,000	30-Jul-96	4-Jun-98	(3) 1998
2	Algeria	UNDP	$194,679	22-Jan-98	11-Feb-98	(1) 1998
3	Antigua & Barbuda	UNDP	$161,500	21-Jul-97	22-Dec-97	(1) 1998
4	Azerbaijan	UNDP	$324,500	16-Jul-97	26-Dec-97	(1) 1998
5	Bahamas	UNDP	$185,300	26-Aug-97	10-Sep-98	(2) 1998
6	Barbados	UNDP	$189,417	31-Oct-97	26-Sep-98	(3) 1999
7	Belize	UNDP	$185,100	8-Jan-98	9-Jun-98	(3) 1998
8	Benin	UNDP	$100,425	3-Sep-98	24-Mar-99	(2) 1999
9	Bhutan	UNDP	$296,000	26-Jun-96	13-Aug-96	(2) 1997
10	Bolivia	UNDP	$185,220	7-Jul-98	1-Sep-98	(3) 1998
11	Burkina Faso	UNDP	$233,810	19-May-97	27-Jan-98	(3) 1997
12	Burundi	UNDP	$319,450	18-Sep-98	19-Jan-99	(2) 1999
13	Cambodia	UNDP	$325,480	24-Mar-97	24-Aug-98	(2) 1998
14	Cape Verde	UNDP	$319,300	18-Mar-97	21-Aug-97	(3) 1997
15	Chad	UNDP	$100,425	23-Aug-99	1-Feb-00	pending
16	Chile	UNDP	$350,000	30-Aug-96	11-Apr-97	(3) 1997
17	Colombia	UNDP	$345,000	24-Jun-99	28-Aug-99	pending
18	Congo	UNDP	$319,450	18-Sep-98	15-Feb-99	pending
19	Congo DR	UNDP	$345,000	7-Mar-97	17-Jul-97	(3) 1997
20	Croatia	UNDP	$345,600	29-May-98	17-Mar-99	(1) 1999
21	Cuba	UNDP	$153,500	18-Aug-98	5-Mar-99	(3) 1999
22	Dominica	UNDP	$168,700	6-Jan-98	28-Oct-98	(3) 1998
23	Dominican Rep	UNDP	$350,000	29-Mar-99	4-May-99	(2) 1999
24	Equador	UNDP	$220,000	29-Mar-99	Pending	(3) 1999
25	El Salvador	UNDP	$320,000	24-Mar-97	9-Sep-97	(2) 1997
26	Eritrea	UNDP	$303,850	4-Sep-96	13-Feb-98	(3) 1998
27	Ethiopia	UNDP	$213,210	19-May-97	31-Jul-98	(2) 1997
28	Gabon	UNDP	$319,450	10-Sep-98	4-Mar-99	(3) 1999
29	Gambia	UNDP	$137,900	24-Mar-97	17-Nov-97	(1) 1997
30	Georgia	UNDP	$325,000	4-Sep-96	20-Jan-97	(1) 1997
31	Ghana	UNDP	$94,760	16-Jul-97	15-Jan-98	(2) 1997
32	Grenada	UNDP	$184,370	26-Aug-98	11-Dec-98	(1) 1998
33	Guatemala	UNDP	$326,000	24-Mar-97	13-Jan-98	(1) 1998
34	Guinea	UNDP	$345,600	19-May-97	9-Feb-98	(2) 1998
35	Guinea Bissau	UNDP	$345,600	5-Jun-97	Pending	
36	Guyana	UNDP	$196,730	27-Oct-97	5-Jun-98	(3) 1998
37	Honduras	UNDP	$325,000	24-Mar-97	7-Nov-97	(3) 1997
38	Indonesia	UNDP	$228,200	13-Nov-97	28-Jul-98	(3) 1998
39	Iran	UNDP	$349,995	24-Jun-97	29-Oct-97	(1) 1998
40	Jamaica	UNDP	$232,780	9-Jan-98	28-Apr-98	(1) 1998
41	Jordan	UNDP	$87,550	15-Dec-97	16-May-98	(1) 1998
42	Korea DPR	UNDP	$154,200	23-Jan-97	3-Apr-97	(3) 1997
43	Lao PDR	UNDP	$313,000	29-Jul-96	22-Oct-96	(2) 1997
44	Lebanon	UNDP	$292,600	11-Jul-96	16-Dec-96	(3) 1996
45	Macedonia	UNDP	$345,000	5-Feb-99	4-Aug-99	(3) 1999
46	Madagascar	UNDP	$350,000	24-Jun-99	Pending	
47	Malawi	UNDP	$193,640	18-Mar-97	22-May-98	(1) 1997
48	Mali	UNDP	$94,760	18-Jul-97	9-Jan-98	(1) 1998
49	Malta	UNDP	$265,000	9-Nov-99	31-Dec-99	pending
50	Moldova	UNDP	$325,000	15-Aug-97	22-Dec-97	(1) 1998
51	Morocco	UNDP	$144,220	6-Oct-99	22-Feb-00	pending
52	Mozambique	UNDP	$216,000	16-Jul-97	10-Feb-98	(2) 1997
53	Nicaragua	UNDP	$299,100	3-Feb-98	14-Jul-98	(2) 1998
54	Niger	UNDP	$345,600	25-Aug-97	1-Apr-98	(3) 1997

No.	Country	IA	Amount (US $)	Date of CEO Approval	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement (By Quarter for UNDP*)
55	Nigeria	UNDP	$259,560	18-Mar-97	23-Oct-97	(3) 1997
56	Panama	UNDP	$298,700	25-Aug-97	11-Aug-98	(3) 1998
57	Paraguay	UNDP	$190,550	27-Jul-98	22-Feb-99	(3) 1999
58	Peru	UNDP	$195,700	16-Jul-97	4-Feb-98	(1) 1998
59	Philippines	UNDP	$154,500	24-Jul-97	27-Nov-97	(3) 1997
60	Senegal	UNDP	$67,100	25-Aug-97	28-Nov-97	(3) 1997
61	Seychelles	UNDP	$250,290	30-Jul-96	3-Dec-96	(2) 1997
62	Sierra Leone	UNDP	$309,000	11-Sep-96		
63	Slovenia	UNDP	$345,000	5-Aug-97	24-Nov-97	(1) 1998
64	Sri Lanka	UNDP	$110,000	21-Mar-97	4-Nov-97	(3) 1997
65	St. Kitts & Nevis	UNDP	$158,620	3-Feb-98	8-Oct-98	(1) 1999
66	St Lucia	UNDP	$169,900	6-Aug-97	16-Jul-98	(3) 1998
67	Sudan	UNDP	$290,000	3-Oct-96	4-Feb-97	(1) 1997
68	Suriname	UNDP	$350,000	10-Sep-98	19-Oct-98	(3) 1999
69	Swaziland	UNDP	$303,850	18-Mar-97	28-Nov-97	(3) 1997
70	Tajikistan	UNDP	$32,700	pending		
71	Thailand	UNDP	$189,500	13-Nov-97	5-Jun-98	(3) 1998
72	Togo	UNDP	$338,040	18-Jun-97	10-Apr-98	(2) 1997
73	Tonga	UNDP	$325,000	27-Oct-99		
74	Trinidad & Tobago	UNDP	$218,870	22-Jan-98	18-May-98	(1) 1999
75	Uganda	UNDP	$83,340	30-Jul-96	28-Dec-97	(1) 1997
76	Uzbekistan	UNDP	$325,500	2-Jan-97	4-Feb-97	(3) 1996
77	Yemen	UNDP	$195,700	19-May-97	13-Aug-97	(2) 1998
78	Behrain	UNEP	$335,000	1-Oct-97	9-Nov-97	13-Nov-97
79	Bangladesh	UNEP	$175,000	16-Mar-99	3-Aug-99	15-Mar-00
80	Cameroon	UNEP	$265,000	16-Jul-97	13-Aug-97	15-Sep-97
81	Central African Republic	UNEP	$350,000	26-Aug-97	20-Nov-97	15-Dec-97
82	Comoros	UNEP	$310,000	6-Nov-98	13-Jan-99	15-Feb-99
83	Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	$327,000	26-Mar-98	4-May-98	29-May-98
84	Djibouti	UNEP	$310,000	23-Nov-98	14-Mar-99	27-Apr-99
85	Haiti	UNEP	$350,000	26-Jan-98	23-Apr-98	15-May-00
86	Kenya	UNEP	$172,800	27-Oct-98	25-Mar-99	15-Jul-99
87	Lesotho	UNEP	$350,000	4-Sep-96	30-Oct-96	3-Dec-96
88	Mauritania	UNEP	$350,000	22-Jul-97	2-Feb-98	6-Feb-98
89	Mauritius	UNEP	$140,000	17-Jul-97	7-Aug-97	4-Sep-97
90	Mongolia	UNEP	$239,500	5-Oct-98	26-Oct-98	15-Nov-98
91	Nepal	UNEP	$310,000	4-Mar-98	22-Jun-99	15-Apr-00
92	Niue	UNEP	$296,000	29-Sep-97	12-Nov-97	26-Nov-97
93	Pakistan	UNEP	$274,000	2-Dec-98	7-Jan-99	2-Feb-99
94	South Africa	UNEP	$321,000	1-Jun-98	14-Oct-98	16-Oct-98
95	Tanzania	UNEP	$254,000	17-Jul-97	25-Aug-97	18-Sep-97
96	Turkmenistan	UNEP	$350,000	17-Jun-97	8-Aug-97	19-Sep-97
97	Vietnam	UNEP	$212,500	6-Nov-98	3-Mar-99	8-Mar-99
98	Zambia	UNEP	$256,000	24-Apr-97	23-Jun-97	4-Jul-97
99	Zimbabwe	UNEP	$93,600	7-Feb-97	6-Mar-97	18-Mar-97
100	St Vincent & Grenadines	World Bank	$349,500			

Total $25,222,282

* The UNDP calendar year is broken into three quarters. The first lasts from Jan.-June and the second two are each three months long.

Enabling Activity Projects Supported Under Non-Expedited Procedures

No	Country	IA	Amount (US $)	Date of CEO Endorse-ment	Date of Project Start (signing of prodoc)	Date of First Disbursement	Date of Submission of First National Communication
1	Argentina	UNDP	$1,000,000	17-Jan-96	16-Feb-96	(1) 1996	25-Jul-97
2	Armenia	UNDP	$350,000	15-Dec-95	7-May-96	(3) 1996	4-Nov-98
3	Botswana	UNDP	$350,000	14-Aug-96	5-Sep-96	(1) 1997	
4	Brazil	UNDP	$1,500,000	14-Jun-96	5-Aug-96	(1) 1997	
5	China	World Bank	$2,000,000	PILOT PHASE			
6	Costa Rica	UNDP	$467,200	7-Jun-96	7-Aug-96	(3) 1996	19-Jul-99
7	Egypt	UNDP	$402,000	22-Apr-96	12-Jun-96	(1) 1997	
8	India	UNDP	$1,500,000	PILOT PHASE			8-Mar-97
9	Jordan	UNDP	$242,000	17-Oct-95	21-Mar-96	(1) 1996	
10	Malaysia	UNDP	$470,000	13-Sep-96	30-Oct-96	(1) 1997	
11	Maldives	UNDP	$863,600	4-Oct-96	16-Jan-97	(1) 1996	9-Dec-97
12	Mexico	UNDP	$306,600	7-Jun-96	29-Oct-96	(1) 1997	
13	Papua N Guinea	UNDP	$345,600	30-Dec-96	30-Dec-96	(2) 1998	15-Oct-97
14	Tunisia	UNDP	$565,000	4-Aug-96	6-Sep-96	(1) 1997	
15	Uruguay	UNDP	$700,000	13-Nov-95	19-Dec-95	(3) 1995	
	Total		$11,062,000				

Regional/Global Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects

	Project	IA	Amount	Date of CEO Approval
1	Asia Least-Cost Greenhouse Gas Abatement Strategy (ALGAS)	UNDP	$9,500,000	PILOT PHASE
2	CARICOM: Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change	World Bank	$6,300,000	10-Feb-97
3	Climate Change Training Phase I (CCTRAIN 1)	UNDP	$900,000	PILOT PHASE
4	Climate Change Training Phase II (CCTRAIN2)	UNDP	$2,700,000	26-Mar-96
5	Country Case Studies on Sources and Sinks of Greenhouse Gases	UNEP	$4,700,000	PILOT PHASE
6	Economics of Greenhouse Gas Limitation - Phase I	UNEP	$3,000,000	18-Jan-96
7	Economics of Greenhouse Gas-Limitation - Phase II	UNEP	$2,000,000	
8	Building Capacity in the Maghreb	UNDP	$2,500,000	PILOT PHASE
9	Pacific Island Climate Change Assistance Project (PICCAP)	UNDP	$2,440,000	20-Mar-97
10	Building Capacity in sub-Saharan Africa	UNDP	$2,000,000	PILOT PHASE
	Total		$36,040,000	

ANNEX 4

DOCUMENTS AND REFERENCES CONSULTED

GEF DOCUMENTS

1. Operational Report On GEF Programs, June 30, 1999
2. Operational Strategy, February 1996
3. The World Bank and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Environment Department Papers, March 1995
4. Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection, UNEP
5. The Costs of Adapting to Climate Change, GEF
6. Biodiversity, International Waters and the GEF, IUCN
7. Study of GEF's Overall Performance, GEF. 1997

UNFCCC DOCUMENTS

1. FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.3, National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: Provision of Technical and Financial Support
2. FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, National Communication from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, Preparation for the Review of Enabling Activities, Views of Parties with regard to the review of the Global Environment Facility

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

1. The Philippine's Initial National Communication on Climate Change, December 1999
2. Republic of Nauru Response, First National Communication under UNFCCC, October 1999
3. Lebanon's First National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Republic of Lebanon, Ministry of Environment, 1999
4. Arab Republic of Egypt, Initial National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, July 1999
5. The Federated States of Micronesia, National Communication prepared Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
6. Cook Islands, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
7. Kiribati Government, Initial National Communication under United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, September 1999
8. Revision of the First National communication Argentine Republic, October 1999
9. Vanuatu National Communication to the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC, July 1999
10. Tuvalu Initial Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, October 1999
11. Chile 1999, Primera Communicacion Nacional, CONAMA
12. Republic of Mauritius, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, April 1999
13. Republic of Zambia, Initial National Communication Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, April 2000

UNEP

1. Enabling Activities for the preparation of the Initial Communication related to the UNFCCC – Draft Evaluation Report, UNEP, Mauritius, Todd Ngara, January 2000
2. Preparation of the Initial National Communication related for the implementation of the UNFCCC – Final Evaluation Report, UNEP, Zimbabwe, December 1998
3. Country Case Studies on Climate Change impacts and adaptation assessments, GF/2200-96-09, UNEP, Michael H. Glantz, May 1998
4. Country Case Studies on emissions and sinks of GHG, Project GF/4102-92-01, Desk Evaluation Report, UNEP, July 1995
5. Economics of Greenhouse Gas Limitations – Phase I : establishment of a methodological framework for Climate Change Mitigation Assessment, Evaluation Report, Emilio LaRovère, February 2000

UNDP

1. Building capacity in Sub-saharan Africa to respond to the UNFCCC, report on the final evaluation mission, November 1998
2. First Draft Report on Mid-term Evaluation of the project "Capacity Building in Maghreb Region to respond to and take advantage of the opportunities offered by national Responses to UNFCCC, April 2000
3. External Evaluation of the concurrent phase of RETA 5592, "A study of Least-Cost GHG Abatement strategy (ALGAS)," July 1999
4. Report on Mid-term Evaluation of the project "Training Programme to support the implementation of the UNFCCC, CC:TRAIN II, March 1999
5. Terminal Report of the project "Training Programme to support the implementation of the UNFCCC, CC:TRAIN II, October 1999

Review

1. 12 country-visit reports, March-June 2000
2. 4 country-study reports, March-June 2000
3. Meeting notes: GEFSEC, The World Bank, UNDP New York, UNEP, UNFCCC Secretariat, February 2000
4. Meeting notes from the 3-days team – retreat, May 2000
5. Parties' views on the review of EA CC process (communications and compilation reports published by the UNFCCC Secretariat)
6. Data bases established by UNDP and UNEP relating to EA CC projects
7. Synthesis Report on NCSP files and database, April 2000
8. Analysis of the survey undertaken by the review, May 2000

ANNEX 5

1996 CRITERIA AND 1997 GUIDELINES: COST NORMS

1996 Criteria		1997 Guidelines	
Activity	***Typical Cost Range***	***Activity***	***Typical Cost Range***
Inventories/Stocktaking - greenhouse gas inventory - vulnerability assessment	 $ 30,000 – 80,000 $ 25,000 – 45,000	**National Circumstances**	
Identification of Options - mitigation options - stage I adaptation	 $ 25,000 - 40,000 $ 25,000 - 40,000	**Greenhouse gas Inventories**	**$ 50,000 – 100,000**
Preparation of Plan, including public awareness building	$ 30,000 - 40,000	**General Description of Steps** (a) programs related to sustainable development, research, public awareness, etc. (b) policy options for monitoring systems and response strategies for impacts. (c) policy frameworks for implementing adaptation measures and response strategies. (d) building capacity to integrate climate change concerns into planning (e) programs to address climate change adverse impacts, incl. Abatement, sink enhancement.	**up to $ 135,000**
		Other Information **(a) Material relevant for global emission trends** **(b) financial, technological needs and constraints**	**up to $ 10,000**
Preparation of national Communication	**$ 15,000 - 20,000**	Compilation and Production of Initial National Communication	**$ 15,000-20,000**
Fixed Project Cost - Project Management - Monitoring/Evaluation	 $ 45,000 – 70,000 $ 5,000 – 15,000	**Project Management** Monitoring/Evaluation	**up to $ 70,000** **up to $ 15,000**
Total	**$ 200,000 - $ 350,000**	**Total**	**up to $350,000**

ANNEX 6

CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS AS INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL CRITERIA FOR ENABLING ACTIVITIES - 1996

1. COVERAGE WITHOUT DUPLICATION:

In assessing a country's needs, past, ongoing, planned and conunitted activities-bilateral activities, multilateral programs, as well as activities undertaken by other agencies-are fully taken into account to ensure that GEF enabling activity projects fill any remaining gaps.

2. APPROPRIATE OVERALL SEQUENCING OF ACTIVITIES:

Projects should be embedded in an overall strategy that leads towards sufficient capacity.

3. GOOD PRACTICE:

Enabling activity projects should follow good practice, and observe established guidelines, using existing tools whenever available.

4. COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Projects adopt the least-cost means of providing assistance to countries.

ANNEX 7

ANNEXES INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL CRITERIA FOR ENABLING ACTIVITIES - 1996

ANNEX A	The Activity Matrix, to be included in each project proposal to summarize, in a concise way, the already existing capabilities in a country, the improvement envisaged through the proposed project, and the gaps remaining after project completion
ANNEX B	Enablement Plan and Appropriate Sequencing, containing guidelines on appropriate sequencing of activities
ANNEX C	Indicative list of Enabling Activity guidelines
ANNEX D	Cost and activity norms used for communication-related enabling activity
ANNEX E	Standard format for proposals for communications-related enabling activities
ANNEX F	Enabling activities and related measures – glossary of terms

ANNEX 8

ANNEXES INCLUDED IN OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR EXPEDITED FINANCING OF INITIAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM NON-ANNEX 1 PARTIES - 1997

ANNEX A	Guidelines for Non-Annex-I Communications
ANNEX B	Expedited GEF Procedures for Enabling Activities
ANNEX C	The Activity Matrix
ANNEX D	Typical Cost Ranges for Proposals for Initial Communications Processed by Expedited Procedures
ANNEX E	Standard Format for Proposals for Communication -Related Enabling Activities
ANNEX F	Enabling Activities and Related Measures - a Glossary of Terms

ANNEX 9

PARAGRAPHS OF DECISION 11/CP.2 THAT ARE RELEVANT TO ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Para (a)(ii)

Projects funded through the financial mechanisms should be country driven and in conformity with, and supportive of, the national development priorities of each country.

Para.b (i)

"Priority should be given to the funding of agreed full costs (or agreed full incremental costs, as appropriate) incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12.1 and other relevant commitments under the Convention. In the initial period, emphasis should be placed on enabling activities undertaken by developing country Parties, such as planning and endogenous capacity building, including institutional strengthening, training, research and education, that will facilitate implementation, in accordance with the Convention, of effective response measures."

Para (b)(ii)

"In this context...institutional development."

Para (b)(iii)

Emphasis should also....responses measures."

Para (b)(iv)

The operating entity... which should, as far as possible, be comprehensive.

Annex 10

Needs and Major Priorities Expressed by the Beneficiary Countries for the Development of the Future EA Projects

The current review had the opportunity to consult with a great number of stakeholders during the 12 country visits, the 5 country studies, and the 2 regional studies. In addition, 60 countries have responded to the survey that was launched by the review, and the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) had previously launched a similar consultation during the last two years, in particular through surveys or evaluation undertaken at the regional workshops held by the NCSP. In particular, countries were asked to identify the CC-related issues that are of priority for them and the gaps that they would hope to fill in the future. The following issues are among the most commonly listed:[1]

- Improvement of the quality of the information related mainly to the GHG inventory, to the vulnerability, to the mitigation options, through the implementation of adequate updating systems within the beneficiary countries (e.g. development of emission factors, etc.);
- Assistance for the establishment of a permanent framework for information and data collection that allow an effective implementation of the UNFCCC;
- Development of more comprehensive and complete Vulnerability and Adaptation assessments;
- Enhancing the countries' capacities to undertake relevant modeling exercises of vulnerability and adaptation;
- Enhancing the countries' capacities to undertake relevant forecasting and modeling exercises for the purpose of developing various emission projections and scenarios;
- Supporting wider dissemination of the technical studies (including internationally) through translation of documents into other relevant languages according to the countries' needs;
- Enhancing the networking and information exchange activities;
- Encouraging the enhancement and/or establishment of regional centers of excellence;
- Enhancing the national and regional expertise through better participation to major international events;

1 Issues are simply listed without reference to any order of priority.

- Meeting the international consultancy needs where requested by the countries;
- Enhancing institutional arrangements for CC (e.g. National Climate Change Committee);
- Enhancing the public, as well as decision-making and political level awareness;
- Better integration of CC concerns into the day-by-day planning activities;
- Prepare the national capacities to deal with the new financial mechanisms (e.g. CDM): Development of project proposals;
- Enhancing the national capacities to formulate project proposals and direct them to the existing financial mechanisms.

ANNEX 11

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SURVEY UNDERTAKEN BY THE REVIEW

GEF

Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433 USA
Tel: (202) 473-0508 - Fax: (202) 522-3240 / (202) 522-3245

Dear Sir/Madam,

Sub: GEF REVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT MANAGERS/ COORDINATORS

I am writing to seek your cooperation to respond to this questionnaire being distributed to collect information on climate change enabling activities as part of a review being undertaken by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).

The GEF is undertaking a review of climate change enabling activities supported by the Facility. This review is being undertaken at the request of the GEF Council. The Conference of the Parties (COP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has specifically requested the GEF review to take into consideration views expressed by the Parties (FCCC/CP/1998/16/Add.1, FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2, and FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.5).

The main objective of the review is to take stock of the past and ongoing experience with the enabling activity projects, assess their effectiveness and extract lessons for the future. The review, managed by the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, is being undertaken by an inter-agency taskforce comprised of staff members from the UNDP, UNEP, the World Bank, and the GEF Secretariat, and led by an international consultant, Dr. Samir Amous. The review proposes to collect as much information as possible from a variety of sources, including desk review of project documents, country visits, country and regional case studies, and questionnaire surveys.

Please answer the questions fully, according to your best knowledge and return the questionnaire to us in electronic format if possible, otherwise by any convenient means, such as fax, or mail. If you need to make further comments, please do so on the space provided underneath the questions, or attach an additional sheet if necessary.

When completing this questionnaire, we also suggest that you consult closely with the project director and other persons who have been involved with the project. This is particularly important if you are not familiar with the issues on all sections of the questionnaire.

The National Communications Support Program (NCSP), being implemented by the UNDP and UNEP, has kindly volunteered to manage the survey on behalf of the review. Please return completed questionnaires to:

Ms. Bo Lim, Ph.D.
Chief Technical Advisor
National Communications Support Programme
UNDP-GEF
Room 1607, 16 Floor
304 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017
Email: bo.lim@undp.org Tel: 1 212 906 5730, Fax: 1 212 906 6568

We would like to thank you in advance for your support and cooperation.

Sincerely Yours,

Jarle Harstad
Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

REVIEW OF GEF'S CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITIES: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT MANAGERS/ COORDINATORS

Country:

Project Name:

GEF Implementing Agency (UNEP, World Bank or UNDP):

Country Executing or Lead Agency:

Brief approval date : .....
Date of signature of the Project Document : .....
Date of the first disbursment to the project account: .....
Date of the implementation of the first activity of the project: .....
Expected Completion Date : .....

Name of the Project Manager/Coordinator : .....
Duty Station Address: .....
Tel : .....
Fax : .....
Email : .....

PROJECT DESIGN

1. Are/were you familiar with the GEF *"Operational Guidelines for expedited financing of initial Communications from Non-Annex I Parties"*?

   [a] Yes [b] No

2. If yes, did you apply these guidelines during project design?

   [a] Yes [b] No

3. In your opinion how does the standard activity matrix reflect the generic needs of your country to prepare the Initial Communication?

   [a] Fully [b] Partly _____

Additions needed .....
.....
.....

4. Cost Benchmarks of Enabling Activities (Table D1 of the Operational Guidelines) provided:

   [a] Clear guidance [b] Needed further details

   What could be added to further guide the budget process? .....
   .....
   .....

5. Was your original funding request for the Enabling Activity Project :

[a] Request fully met [b] Minor reduction of the Budget

[c] Major reduction of the Budget [d] Rejected

6. Did you receive any feedback from the respective GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP, UNEBr World Bank or) for the final budget ?

[a] Yes [b] No

7. Did you find the feedback satisfactory

[a] Yes [b] No

If No, please provide any relevant explanation:.....

.....

.....

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

8. Was/Were there (any) component(s) of enabling activities, which could have been improved in implementation had been more funds allotted to it/them (please feel free to modify if the categories do not match your specific project document ?

	Project Budget	The suggested "more appropriate" budget
Greenhouse Gas Inventories		
Vulnerability assessment		
Policy Frameworks for Implementing Adaptation Measures and Response Strategies		
Building Capacity to integrate Climate Change Concerns into Planning		
GHG Mitigation abatement strategy, sink enhancement		
Other Information, including emissions projections		
Assessment of Financial & Technological Needs		
Compilation and Production of Initial National Communication		
Any other activity (please specify)		

Any additional comment ? .....

.....

9. Flexibility of the budget allocations to the country's needs:

During the project formulation ? [a] Flexible [b] Not flexible

During the project implementation ? [a] Flexible [b] Not flexible

10. Are/were you able to have an easy access to materials, such as :

IPCC GHG Inventory Guidelines [a] Yes [b] No

Any specific comments?.....

.....

GHG mitigation materials [a] Yes [b] No

Any specific comments?.....

.....

Vulnerability/Adaptation materials, etc.): [a] Yes [b] No

Any specific comments?.....

.....

In your opinion, what additional materials would have been useful or have to be developed ?

.....

.....

11. Please assess the level of participation of the following stakeholder groups (please feel free to add any institution that is not in the list):

11.1. Main governmental departments

Department of Energy	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Environment	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Forestry	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Agriculture	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Transport	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Industry	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Planning	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
Department of Meteorology	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
.....	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
.....	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___

11.2 Academic and Scientific Community Full ___ Partly ____ None ___

11.3 Local NGOs Full ___ Partly ____ None ___

11.4 Private Sector Full ___ Partly ____ None ___

11.5 Other stakeholders (Pls. Specify)

.....	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___
.....	Full ___ Partly ____ None ___

Please add any comment where relevant .....

12. What was the experience in the utilization of consultants? (please answer Yes or No on the box):

	Local/regional Consultants	International Consultan
Easy availability?		
Expensive?		
Highly capable?		
Needed training in order to address specific climate change issues Please specify, on what?		

13. Did the use of international consultants help in developing local capacity?

a Yes No b

14. If Yes, please outline how : .....

.....

15. Assistance of the GEF Implementing Agency

How is/was the implementation support provided by the Implementing Agency ?

a Highly satisfactory b Satisfactory

c Unsatisfactory d Highly unsatisfactory

Please outline any additional comment : .....

16. Have you :

Requested any assistance provided by the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) ?

a Yes b No

Benefitted from any assistance from the National Communication Support Programme (NCSP) ?

a Yes b No

17. If yes, what is your opinion on the assistance provided by this Programme (NCSP)

.....

.....

18. As project coordinator for CC enabling activities in this particular country, what kind of additional assistance you would have hoped to obtain in order to better meet the Enabling Activity objectives?

.....

.....

19. Was there complementary between Climate Change enabling activities and the following related projects/programs? (Please say Yes or No or put NA if the project or program is not present in the country):

Regular GEF project(s) _____

Climate Change Projects of Bilateral Agencies _____

Climate Change Projects of Multilateral Agencies _____

Government-Funded Climate Change Projects _____

NGO-managed/supported Climate Change Projects _____

Others (Please specify) _____

PROJECT RESULTS

20. What were the contributions of Regional/Global enabling activity projects to country level enabling activities? (Put a check on those items below that applies):

	Regional Projects	Global Projects
Provided scientific data		
Helped prepare local experts		
Created wide awareness		
Lowered cost of stocktaking		
Other contributions		

21. Was there a "spill-over" of the benefits of your Enabling Activity Project to other countries ?

[a] Yes [b]

If yes, please specify : .....

.....

22. To what extent have enabling activities progressed towards contributing to:

22.1 Establishment of national institutional arrangements to address Climate Change issues

Full ____ Process still on-going ____ No progress at all _____

Problems encountered? .....

.....

22.2 Enhancement of local capacities

Full ____ Partly _____ Minimal ____ None at all _____

Reasons for less than full progress? .....

.....

22.3 Strengthening of public awareness and development of network of constituencies on climate change

Full ____ Partly _____ Minimal ____ None at all _____

Reasons for less than full progress? .....

.....

23. To what degree are climate change issues being integrated intosectorial and national priorities as they are/were identified during preparation of initial national communications.

[a] Well integrated [b] Partly integrated

[c] Not integrated at all

Reason for the above?.....

.....

.....

.....

OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE

24. What were the most serious problems encounteredby your project?:

24.1 proposal development _____

24.2 proposal review _____

24.3 start up _____

24.4 implementation _____

24.5 disbursement issues ? _____

Please specify where relevant : .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

25. Please list at least two most important lessons learned or/and any Good practice that helped you to address some difficulties during the project implementation (best if you can relate these to the problems in question above).

25.1 .....

25.2 .....

ANNEX 12

SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF THE PARTIES REGARDING THE REVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

1. Parties that submitted their views

	First round of submissions (FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.2)	Second round of submissions (FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.5)
Mexico	Yes	
Philippines	Yes	
Switzerland	Yes	
USA	Yes	
Chile		Yes
Kenya		Yes
Sudan		Yes
Uzbekistan		Yes

2. Compilation of the main issues addressed by the submissions and that directly relate to the Review of the existing EA projects:

2.1 The review should to report transparently on :

- Participating agencies to the review
- Timing and location of the review
- The review approach
- Parties participation

2.2 The review should cover all Enabling Activity projects, including those that don't directly relate to the preparation of the National Communication

2.3 The review should lead to a clearer understanding of the past project performance and help identify measures to increase the effectiveness of EA in the future.

The issues that should be covered include :

- The actual EA project cycle (from official request to the effective availability of funds and the effects of the EP procedure)
- Functionality of the guidance process (COP to GEF)
    - How and in which conditions the revision of the operational programmes is handled by the GEF as to meet the COP guidance
    - How the process could be improved

- Operational effectiveness of the implementation of EA projects
    - Adequacy of the IA management support (including mid-term evaluation, monitoring, tripartite review, etc.)
    - Clarity of the guidelines on the expected products and timetables for implementation
    - Quality of the project management within the recipient countries
    - Adequacy of the financial control
    - Which aspects of project management are found most important for achieving the project objectives and completing the project activities in a timely manner
- Problems related to national level implementation by the implementing agencies which might have posed difficulty for Non Annex I Parties in the implementation of their commitment under the UNFCCC :
    - Consistency of actions taken by the IAs with the UNFCCC and COP decisions (with some relevant examples)
    - Effectiveness of taking the Annex-I Parties priorities into account
    - Effectiveness of encouraging the use of national experts/consultants
    - Issues related to the effective availability of funds
    - Issues related to the amounts available VS. the amounts requested and the reason for any difference
- Consideration of any additional issue or concern identified by Non-Annex I Party in the implementation of EA
- Example of the application of the concept of "Agreed full cost"
- Flexibility of the funds
- The review should also take other-than-GEF contributions to the elaboration of National Communications into account (multilateral, bilateral)
- The review should identify any needs for enabling activities as they might have been defined by the National Communications that were published so far
- Quality of the outputs produced by the EA projects, including the activities that relate to National communications
- Interaction between Enabling Activities and Economic Development Programmes of the recipient countries
- Effectiveness of the integration of the policies and measures that were identified into the general development policies of the recipient countries

3. Compilation of the main issues addressed by the submissions that relate to the recommendations for the future EA projects[1]:

- Issues to be address in the future by the Enabling Activity projects
  - Updating the GHG inventory
  - Social, Economic and Environmental Impact Assessment of mitigation options
  - Mitigation options
  - Energy technology assessments
  - Regional studies on vulnerability and adaptation, climate variability and climate change
  - Building capacity of the Non-Annex I Parties for participating in the process of design and implementation of the mechanisms under the Kyoto protocol and for increasing their capabilities to create new investment partnerships
  - Capacity building needed in validation, monitoring, verification, auditing, certification and registration of CDM projects
  - Development of Information Systems
  - Building capacity of the Non-Annex I Parties for participating in systematic observation networks
  - Develop, strengthen and improve national activities for public awareness and education on climate change
  - Maintaining and enhancing relevant national capacities
  - Translating, reproducing, disseminating and making the National Communications available electronically
  - Providing Support to institutional activities (e.g. national CC centres)

[1] Also extracted from FCCC/SBI/1999/INF.10